

2022

CALENDAR YEAR

MISSOURI

JUVENILE

&

FAMILY DIVISION

ANNUAL REPORT



MISSOURI COURTS  
Judicial Branch of Government



## Table of Contents

<b>Section 1: Missouri’s Youth Population</b> .....	5
Figure 1-1 Youth Population .....	5
Figure 1-2 Projected Youth Population.....	5
Figure 1-3 Projected Youth Population by Sex .....	6
Figure 1-4 Projected Youth Population by Sex and Age .....	6
Figure 1-5 Projected Youth Population by Race .....	7
<b>Section 2: Juvenile &amp; Family Division Referrals</b> .....	8
Table 2-1 Source of Referrals.....	9
Figure 2-1 Referrals by Referral Type .....	10
Figure 2-2 Referrals by Sex .....	10
Figure 2-3 Referrals by Race .....	11
Table 2-2 Referrals by Age .....	11
Figure 2-4 Youth Referral Trend .....	12
Figure 2-5 Youth Referral by Sex.....	12
Figure 2-6 Youth Referral by Race .....	13
Figure 2-7 Youth Referrals by Action Taken .....	16
Figure 2-8 Youth Referrals by Outcome .....	16
<b>Section 3: Law Violation Referrals</b> .....	17
Table 3-1 Source of Law Violations Referrals .....	17
Figure 3-1 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level .....	18
Figure 3-2 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Sex.....	18
Figure 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race.....	19
Figure 3-4 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age .....	19
Table 3-2 Top Law Violation Referrals .....	20
Table 3-3 Top Law Violation Referrals by Major Allegation and Age Group .....	21
Figure 3-5 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken .....	22
Figure 3-6 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken .....	22
<b>Section 4: Status Offense Referrals</b> .....	23
Table 4-1 Source of Status Offense Referrals .....	23
Figure 4-1 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation .....	24
Figure 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Sex .....	24

Table 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race.....	25
Table 4-3 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Age .....	26
Figure 4-4 Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken .....	27
Figure 4-5 Status Offense Referrals by Outcome .....	27
<b>Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals.....</b>	<b>28</b>
Table 5-1 Source of CA/N Referrals .....	28
Figure 5-1 CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type .....	29
Figure 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Sex.....	29
Table 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race.....	30
Table 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age .....	30
Figure 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Action Taken .....	31
Figure 5-4 CA/N Referrals by Outcome .....	31
<b>Section 6: Assessment &amp; Classification.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Figure 6-1 Risk by Level.....	34
Figure 6-2 Risk Level by Sex .....	34
Figure 6-3 Risk Level by Race .....	35
Tables 6-1 Risk Factors.....	36
Tables 6-2 Need Factors.....	38
<b>Section 7: Detention .....</b>	<b>42</b>
Table 7-1 General Youth Population August 31, 2022 .....	43
Figure 7-1 General Admissions by Sex.....	43
Figure 7-2 General Admissions by Race.....	44
Figure 7-3 General Admissions by Sex and Race .....	44
Figure 7-4 General Admissions by Age Group .....	45
Figure 7-5 General Admissions by Sex and Age Group.....	45
Figure 7-6 General Admissions by Race and Age Group .....	46
Figure 7-7 General Average Daily Population by Sex.....	46
Figure 7-8 General Average Daily Population by Race .....	47
Figure 7-9 General Average Daily Population by Sex and Race.....	47
Figure 7-10 General Average Daily Population by Age Group.....	48
Figure 7-11 General Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex.....	48
Figure 7-12 General Average and Median Length of Stay by Race .....	49
Figure 7-13 General Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race .....	49

Figure 7-14 General Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race .....	50
Figure 7-15 General Median Length of Stay by Age Group .....	50
Figure 7-16 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex .....	51
Figure 7-17 Certified Youth Admissions by Race .....	51
Figure 7-18 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Race.....	52
Figure 7-19 Certified Youth Admissions by Age Group .....	52
Figure 7-20 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group.....	53
Figure 7-21 Certified Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group.....	53
Figure 7-22 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex.....	54
Figure 7-23 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Race.....	54
Figure 7-24 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race .....	55
Figure 7-25 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Age .....	55
Figure 7-26 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex.....	56
Figure 7-27 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race.....	56
Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race.....	57
Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race .....	57
Figure 7-29 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Age .....	58
<b>Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments .....</b>	<b>59</b>
Figure 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex and Race.....	59
Figure 8-2 Statewide DYS Commitments by Age Group.....	59
Tables 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex, Race, and Age Group .....	60
<b>Section 9: Certification to Adult Court.....</b>	<b>61</b>
Figure 9-1 Certifications by Sex .....	61
Figure 9-2 Certifications by Race .....	62
Figure 9-3 Certifications by Age.....	62
Figure 9-4 Certifications Trends by Race .....	63
<b>Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism.....</b>	<b>64</b>
Figure 10-1 Missouri Youth Offender Population.....	65
Figure 10-2 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (All Law).....	65
Figure 10-3 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Misd A or Felony).....	66
Figure 10-4 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony) .....	66
Figure 10-5 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year.....	67
Figure 10-6 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex .....	67

Figure 10-7 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race .....	68
Figure 10-8 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type.....	68
Figure 10-9 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age.....	69
<b>Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED).....</b>	<b>70</b>
Table 11-1 Identifying the Numerical Bases for Rate Calculations.....	72
Table 11-2 Relative Rate Index (RRI) Values.....	72
Table 11-3 Statewide Relative Rate Indices.....	73
Figure 11-1 Ten-Year Trend of Statewide RRI for Referrals of Black Youth .....	73
<b>Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload.....</b>	<b>74</b>
Table 12-1 Workload Values per Year from Juvenile Officer Workload Study (2020) .....	75
Table 12-2 Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload.....	76
<b>Section 13: CA/N Time Standards.....</b>	<b>77</b>
Table 13-1 CA/N Hearings Held Timely.....	78
<b>Section 14: Juvenile and Family Division Programs and Diversion.....</b>	<b>80</b>
Table 14-1 Juvenile Program Categories and the number of Participants.....	82
Table 14-2 Juvenile Diversion Programs and the number of participants .....	83
Program Spotlights Around the State.....	84

## Section 1: Missouri's Youth Population

Section 1 describes the 2021 population of Missouri's youth (ages 5-17).

Figure 1-1 Youth Population

In CY21, Missouri's youth population, ages 5-17, was 1,081,787. This represents roughly a 7.8% increase from the previous year; and a 7.2% increase from 2017.

Source table 2017-2020: [Population Estimates by Age - MCDC \(missouri.edu\)](#)

Source table 2021: [State Population by Characteristics: 2020-2022 \(census.gov\)](#)




Figure 1-2 Projected Youth Population

Population projections, compiled in 2008 for the Missouri youth population, suggested it will decrease until approximately 2015. From 2015-2020, it was projected to have a 2.7% increase. Then, the rate of change decreases by roughly 3 percentage points for each following 5-year projection. This results in only a projected 1.8% increase in population from 2025-2030.

Source Table: [Web Formatting \(Male and Female Combined\).xls \(mo.gov\)](#)




Figure 1-3 Projected Youth Population by Sex

In CY21, 51% [554,659] of Missouri’s youth population was male and 49% [527,128] was female.

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: 2020-2022 \(census.gov\)](#)




Figure 1-4 Projected Youth Population by Sex and Age

In CY21, males outnumbered females across all age groups in Missouri’s population of 5-17-year-old youths. The largest age group for both sexes was 13.

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: 2020-2022 \(census.gov\)](#)





Figure 1-5 Projected Youth Population by Race

Using the population with only one race, the youth population in Missouri is 73% [786,264] white. Black is the second most common race for 5-17 years old at 15% [166,816] followed by Hispanic at 7% [79,299], Asian/Pacific Islander at 3% [36,954], and Native American at 1% [12,454].

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: 2020-2022 \(census.gov\)](https://www.census.gov)





## Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) define a juvenile and family division referral as *“the initial information provided to the juvenile officer from the referring agency inclusive of the identifying information and basis for the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.”* For the purpose of annual reporting, unless otherwise indicated, disposed referrals represent the unit of measurement, not individual youth. A disposition refers to the outcome or finding of a referral [see pages 13-14] for details about how these dispositions and outcomes are reported in Missouri’s Judicial Information System (JIS)]. In July 2021, the maximum age for referrals raised from 16-17.

The juvenile and family division is responsible for processing and supervising four referral types:

- **Status Offenses:** Status offense referrals include Behavior Injurious to Self/Others, Habitually Absent from Home, Truancy, Beyond Parental Control, and Status-Other. **Note:** The following offenses are also counted as Status Offenses: Juvenile Municipal Ordinance for Curfew and Possession/use of a tobacco product. All other municipal ordinance violations that are explicitly labeled with “JUVMUNI” in the charge code are considered delinquency (<https://www.courts.mo.gov/file.jsp?id=2018>).
- **Law Offenses:** Law offense referrals include all criminal violations listed in the Missouri Charge Code Manual, including infraction and ordinance violations.
- **Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N):** CA/N referrals are allegations of child abuse or neglect where the child is the victim or custody related matters are an issue. Abuse referrals include Abuse-Emotional, Abuse-Incest, Abuse-Other Sexual, and Physical Abuse. Neglect referrals include Abandonment, Neglect-Education, Neglect-Improper Care/Supervision, Neglect-Medical Care, Neglect-Surgical Care, and Neglect-Other. Custody referrals include Abduction, Protective Custody, Transfer of Custody, Termination of Parental Rights, and Relief of Custody.
- **Administrative:** Administrative referrals include Violation of Valid Court Order, Juvenile Informal Supervision/Technical Violation, and Juvenile Formal Supervision/Technical Violation. Counts of Administrative referrals throughout this report include these additional violations: Prob / Parole Violation and Probation Violation (Municipal Ordinance). While not sanctioned for use on juvenile referrals, circuits have used these charge codes in calendar year 2022.

Section 2 presents information on disposed referrals at the state level for the juvenile and family division in calendar 2022.

Table 2-1 Source of Referrals

Referrals to Missouri’s juvenile and family division originate from a variety of sources. In CY22, 53% of all referrals originated from some type of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [41%]. The Children’s Division of Missouri’s Department of Social Services accounted for 18% of all referrals. An additional 18% of referrals occurred at schools (School Personnel and Resource Officer).

Missing Data [535]

<b>Source of Referral</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Municipal Police	17,473	40.7%
Children’s Division	7,800	18.2%
School Personnel	5,020	11.7%
County Sheriff	4,349	10.1%
School Resource Officer	2,688	6.3%
Parent	1,751	4.1%
Juvenile Court Personnel	1,729	4.0%
Other	600	1.4%
Other Juvenile Court	474	1.2%
Other Law Enforcement	468	1.1%
Highway Patrol	303	1.1%
Private Social Agency	142	0.7%
Other Relative	87	0.3%
Public Social Agency	34	0.2%
Victim or Self	30	0.1%
Department of Mental Health	9	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>42,957</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 2-1 Referrals by Referral Type

In CY22, a total of 43,492 referrals were disposed. The largest percentage [40%, 17,267] was for delinquency allegations. The rest of the referrals were divided between abuse/neglect allegations [29%, 12,554], status offenses [29%, 12,823], and administrative offenses [2%, 848].

Missing Data [0]

**Note:** Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations for Curfew and Possession/use of a tobacco product are considered status offenses.




Figure 2-2 Referrals by Sex

For all the disposed referrals in CY22, males accounted for 61% [26,291] and females for the remaining 39% [17,112].

Missing Data [89]




Figure 2-3 Referrals by Race

Approximately, 68% [29,533] of all disposed referrals were for white youth. The second largest percentage of referrals were 27% [11,620] for black youth. The remaining groups were Hispanic youth which accounted for 2.8% [1,209], Asian/Pacific Islander youth which accounted for 0.6% [261], and Native American youth which accounted for 0.4% [153].

Missing Data [716]

**Note:** Missing Data includes the Unknown race option




Table 2-2 Referrals by Age

Those under 10 years of age, represented 18.8% [8,176] of all referrals. Youth aged 16, accounted for the next largest proportion of referrals, [16.4%, 7,119], followed by youth aged 15, [15.8%, 6,872] and youth aged 14 [13.4%, 5,805].

Missing Data [24]

Age	Frequency	Percentage
<10	8,176	18.8%
10	1,017	2.3%
11	1,465	3.4%
12	2,620	6.0%
13	4,183	9.6%
14	5,805	13.4%
15	6,872	15.8%
16	7,119	16.4%
17	5,547	12.8%
> = 18	664	1.5%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>43,468</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 2-4 Youth Referral Trend

The total number of disposed referrals declined by 28% from 2012 to 2022. The trend shows the greatest decrease in administrative referrals (-39%). All other referral types decreased: Status referrals (-18%), CA/N referrals (-26%), and delinquency referrals (-35%) over that period. Since last year, there was a decrease in CA/N referral types (-9%). There was an increase in all other case types: administrative (33%), delinquency (38%), and status (19%).




Figure 2-5 Youth Referral by Sex

Disposed referrals declined more for females (-30%) than for males (-27%) from 2012 to 2022. Between 2021 and 2022, the number of referrals for males increased by 18% and the number of referrals for females increased by 11%.





Figure 2-6 Youth Referral by Race

From 2012-2022, disposed referrals declined for Native American youth (-37.8%), White youth (-31.2%), Black youth (-28.0%), Asian/Pacific Islander youth (-14.0%), and Hispanic youth (-7.3%)

**Note:** Asian/Pacific Islander and Native American youth are not displayed to maintain readability.



## Referral Outcomes

The juvenile and family division will respond to referrals either through a formal or informal process. Through the formal process, a juvenile officer files a petition in the juvenile and family division to have a judge hear and determine the outcome of the allegations contained in the petition. Through the informal process, a juvenile officer determines the outcome of the allegations contained in the referral without filing a petition seeking formal judicial jurisdiction. The following referral outcomes are recorded on the ***Site Defined (COASITE)*** form when a VDYS (DYS Data) docket code is entered on the ***Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)*** form in Judicial Information System (JIS).

### Formal Outcomes:

- **Allegation True, Youth Receives Out-of-Home Placement** – A judicial action finding the allegation true. Youth is placed out-of-home with the Division of Youth Services (DYS), in foster care, with a relative, or with a private or public agency.
- **Allegation True, Youth Receives In-Home Services** – A judicial action finding the allegation true. Youth receives services while remaining in his or her home. This outcome requires the youth to receive supervision through the juvenile division.
- **Allegation True, No Services** – A judicial action finding the allegation true; however, the youth receives no services or supervision.
- **Allegation Not True** – A judicial action which results in the termination of a juvenile case during the initial juvenile division hearing because the allegation is found not true.
- **Sustain Motion to Dismiss** – A judicial action which results in a motion to dismiss the petition before the initial division hearing.
- **Juvenile Certified – Felony Allegation** - A judicial action sustaining a motion to dismiss a petition to the juvenile division and allow prosecution of youth under the general law.

## Informal Outcomes:

- **Informal Adjustment without Supervision:** Any informal non-judicial activity that occurs without the filing of a petition and does not involve supervision of youth. Although services may be monitored, this disposition does not include direct supervision of a youth in accordance with the Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards. However, because the disposition is applied on the basis of an informal adjustment conference, completion of the mandated risk and needs assessments is required when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.
- **Informal Adjustment with Supervision:** Any informal non-judicial activity that occurs without the filing of a petition and involves supervision of youth by written agreement and complies with Missouri Supreme Court Rules for an informal adjustment conference and the relevant contact standards contained in the Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards. This disposition requires completion of the risk and needs assessment when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.
- **Informal Adjustment – No Action:** Any informal non-judicial activity that entails no more than brief face-to-face, telephone, or warning letter with the intent to inform, counsel, and warn the youth and/or family regarding a referral received. No official informal adjustment conference, per Supreme Court Rule is held; therefore, completion of the mandated risk or needs assessments is not required when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.
- **Transfer to Other Juvenile Division:** A non-judicial activity where a youth's case file and associated records are transferred to another juvenile division for disposition. Depending on when this disposition is applied, an official informal adjustment conference and associated assessments may or may not occur.
- **Transfer to Other Agency:** A non-judicial activity where a youth's case file and associated records are transferred to another agency (CD, DMH, DYS, or other public or private agency) for disposition. Depending on when this disposition is applied, an official informal adjustment conference and associated assessments may or may not occur.
- **Referral Rejected:** The referral is rejected because there is insufficient information for administrative action to proceed or the referral is found not true. No informal adjustment conference is conducted and no assessments are required.



Figure 2-7 Youth Referrals by Action Taken

In CY22, 75% [32,800] of all referrals were disposed through the informal process. Only 23% [10,126] of referrals required formal court intervention. Remaining cases are missing disposition information.

Missing Data [566]

**Youth Referrals by Action Taken**





Figure 2-8 Youth Referrals by Outcome

Informal Adjustment – No Action [18.6%, 8,089] was the most frequently used informal finding, and the most frequently used formal finding was Allegation Found True with Out-of-Home Placement [14.6%, 6,370].

Missing Data [567]

\*Formal outcomes

**Total Referrals by Outcome**



## Section 3: Law Violation Referrals

Section 3 describes law violation referrals disposed by Missouri’s juvenile and family division. Law violation referrals made up 40% of all referrals disposed in calendar 2022. A law violation referral is counted as a single delinquent act represented by the most serious allegation charged (misdemeanor or higher). However, multiple delinquent acts may be associated with a single referral.

**Note:** Infractions and municipal ordinances are included under law violations. Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/use of a tobacco product are listed under status offenses.

Table 3-1 Source of Law Violations Referrals

The source of 85% of law violation referrals was some form of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [67.2%] and county sheriff departments [14.2%]. Schools were the second highest referring agency [13%] (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined).

Missing Data [153]

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage
Municipal Police	11,509	67.2%
County Sheriff	2,431	14.2%
School Resource Officer	1,740	10.2%
School Personnel	403	2.4%
Other Law Enforcement	314	1.8%
Highway Patrol	230	1.3%
Other Juvenile Court	180	1.1%
Children’s Division	133	0.8%
Juvenile Court Personnel	92	0.5%
Parent	33	0.2%
Other	31	0.2%
Public Social Agency	7	0.0%
Victim or Self	6	0.0%
Other Relative	4	0.0%
Private Social Agency	1	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,114</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 3-1 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level

The most common charge level for law referrals was misdemeanor [63.9%, 11,035] with Class A misdemeanors accounting for the largest amount [34.7%, 6,000]. Felonies represented 31.5% of law referrals, with Class D being the most common type of felony referral [14.8%, 2,556]. Roughly five percent of all law violations were for Class A and B felonies [370 & 445].

Missing Data [0]




Figure 3-2 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Sex

Law violations at the misdemeanor level were the most common allegation for both male and female offenders. However, within sex, the percentage of referrals for misdemeanors was higher for females [71%, 3,597] than for males [60%, 7,414]. Conversely, males were referred at a higher rate [36%, 4,432] for felonies than were females [21%, 1,004].

Missing Data [33]




Figure 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race

Misdemeanor was the most common charge among all race categories. As a percentage, felony referrals were higher for youth of color than white youth: Native American youth [46%, 11], Black youth [39%, 2,408], Hispanic youth [35%, 150], Asian/Pacific Islander youth [31%, 24], White youth [27%, 2,807].

Missing Data [167]




Figure 3-4 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age

Youth age 16 years old were responsible for the largest number of misdemeanors [2,315]. Youth aged 17 accounted for the largest number of felonies [1,292]. Youth age 10 were proportionally the most likely to commit misdemeanors (77%, 121), while youth aged 18 and older were proportionally the most likely to commit felonies [54%, 275].

Missing Data [8]




Table 3-2 Top Law Violation Referrals

Violations for Assault, Property Damage, Dangerous Drugs, Stealing, and Peace Disturbance accounted for the majority [70%] of major allegations on law referrals. The Top 5 Law Violations remain unchanged from the previous year. According to *Juvenile Court Statistics 2020* report published by the National Center for Juvenile Justice, assault was also the most common offense for juveniles in the United States. Following assault, the next highest number of cases handled by juvenile courts nationwide were larceny-theft and then followed by obstruction of justice. Missing Data [0] **Note:** Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/use of a tobacco product are considered status offenses.

<b>Top Law Violations</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Assault	4,612	26.7%
Property Damage	2,349	13.6%
Dangerous Drugs	1,959	11.3%
Stealing	1,856	10.7%
Peace Disturbance	1,260	7.3%
Sexual Assault	780	4.5%
Liquor Laws	514	3.0%
Invasion of Privacy	498	2.9%
Burglary	469	2.7%
Obstructing Police	415	2.4%
Weapons	395	2.3%
Municipal Charges	333	1.9%
Health and Safety	268	1.6%
Threats	248	1.4%
Robbery	210	1.2%
Obscenity	208	1.2%
Sex Offenses	166	1.0%
Motor Vehicle Violations	139	0.8%
Public Order Crimes	122	0.7%
Obstruct Judicial Process	98	0.6%
Fraud	65	0.4%
Arson	57	0.3%
Homicide	54	0.3%
Conservation	42	0.2%
Stolen Property	36	0.2%
Flight/Escape	34	0.2%
Family Offenses	28	0.2%
Juvenile Offenses	18	0.1%
Other	15	0.1%
Forgery	13	0.1%
Kidnapping	6	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,267</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 3-3 Top Law Violation Referrals by Major Allegation and Age Group

Forty four percent of all juvenile law violation referrals were committed by youth aged 15 and 16. These youth were responsible for 53% of homicides, 54% of drug charges, 53% of liquor law violations, 52% of robberies, and 48% of stealing referrals. Only threats, forgery and municipal charges were committed at a higher rate by youth 13-14. Missing Data [8]

**Note:** Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/use of a tobacco product are considered status offenses.

Major Allegation/Age	<10	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	>=18	Total
Assault	78	68	146	344	603	790	862	892	766	63	4,612
Property Damage	17	21	46	116	233	369	566	475	439	67	2,349
Dangerous Drugs	4	3	8	62	136	220	344	523	607	52	1,959
Stealing	15	18	39	74	140	230	376	452	451	61	1,856
Peace Disturbance	12	10	39	88	148	242	283	213	207	16	1,258
Sexual Assault	27	10	20	48	63	108	126	137	143	95	777
Liquor Laws	0	0	3	9	25	48	73	150	183	23	514
Invasion of Privacy	8	6	6	28	84	70	99	92	95	7	495
Burglary	3	4	9	25	56	72	81	113	86	20	469
Obstructing Police	1	1	5	6	29	59	91	98	112	13	415
Weapons	4	2	12	17	26	36	58	103	129	8	395
Municipal Charges	0	1	12	29	50	45	61	59	71	5	333
Health and Safety	1	0	10	21	32	44	47	69	40	4	268
Threats	3	2	12	32	56	50	44	27	16	6	248
Robbery	0	0	1	4	13	27	41	55	61	8	210
Obscenity	0	3	5	17	34	43	43	37	21	5	208
Sex Offenses	4	4	9	13	22	21	29	22	10	32	166
Motor Vehicle Violations	0	0	1	0	12	25	23	28	43	7	139
Public Order Crimes	0	0	2	2	4	14	29	42	27	2	122
Obstruct Judicial Process	0	0	0	8	5	12	18	21	31	3	98
Fraud	0	0	0	5	3	10	13	12	21	1	65
Arson	1	3	7	10	8	3	13	10	2	0	57
Homicide	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	15	20	7	54
Conservation	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	11	19	1	42
Stolen Property	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	10	16	1	36
Flight/Escape	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	9	13	2	34
Family Offenses	5	0	0	0	2	0	6	7	5	3	28
Juvenile Offenses	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	2	4	0	18
Other	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	4	3	1	15
Forgery	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3	1	13
Kidnapping	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>962</b>	<b>1796</b>	<b>2560</b>	<b>3357</b>	<b>3692</b>	<b>3646</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>17,259</b>

Figure 3-5 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken

Eighty-three percent [14,399] of law violation referrals were disposed through the informal adjustment process. Sixteen percent [2,698] required formal court intervention. Remaining cases are missing outcome information.

Missing Data [170]





Figure 3-6 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken

The most frequently used methods of disposing law violation referrals were Referral Rejected [22.1%, 3,817] and Informal Adjustment No Action [18.9%, 3,255]. Allegation Found True with In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal outcome [8.4%, 1,453], followed by Allegation Found True-Out-of-Home Placement [3.5%, 603]. Less than 1% [82] of referrals resulted in petitions for Certification to Adult Court.

Missing Data [170]

\*Formal outcomes



## Section 4: Status Offense Referrals

Section 4 describes status offense referrals disposed by the juvenile and family division. Status offense referrals made up 29% of all referrals in calendar 2022. A status violation referral is counted as a single behavioral act represented by the most serious allegation charged. However, multiple status offense acts may be associated with a single referral. Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations for Curfew and Possession/use of a tobacco product are considered Status offenses.

Table 4-1 Source of Status Offense Referrals

Forty nine percent of status violation referrals originated from some form of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [37%] and county sheriff departments [12%]. Schools [36%] were the second highest referring agency (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined), followed by parents [7%] and Children’s Division [3%].

Missing Data [16]

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage
Municipal Police	4,690	36.6%
School Personnel	3,807	29.7%
County Sheriff	1,530	11.9%
Parent	890	6.9%
School Resource Officer	825	6.4%
Children’s Division	403	3.1%
Juvenile Court Personnel	337	2.6%
Other Juvenile Court	72	0.6%
Other Law Enforcement	71	0.6%
Other	54	0.4%
Other Relative	47	0.4%
Highway Patrol	38	0.3%
Victim or Self	17	0.1%
Public Social Agency	12	0.1%
Private Social Agency	9	0.1%
DMH	5	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,807</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



Figure 4-1 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation

Behavior Injurious to Self or Others [39%, 4,975] was the most frequent status offense for which youth were referred, followed by Truancy [24%, 3,039]. Muni-Curfew and Muni-Possession/Use of A Tobacco Product constitutes less than 3% of status offense referrals.




Figure 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Sex

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common allegation for both males [42%, 3,061] and females [34%, 1,906]. Proportionally, females were more likely than males to be referred for Truancy and Habitually Absent from Home. Beyond Parental Control was proportionally the same amongst male [13%, 961] and female youth [13%, 717].

Missing Data [20]




Table 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common reason to be referred for White youth [41%, 3,861] and Hispanic youth [39%, 135]. Black youth were equally referred for Habitually Absent from Home [33%, 912] and Behavior Injurious to Self/Others [33%, 900]. Native American youth [50%, 15] and Asian/Pacific Islander [49%, 35] youth were most referred for Truancy.

Missing Data [178]

**Note:** Missing Data includes the Unknown race option

<b>Allegation /Race</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>Asian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Native American</b>	<b>Total</b>
Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	3,861	900	135	26	11	4,933
Truancy	2,397	403	110	35	15	2,960
Habitually Absent From Home	1,290	912	32	5	1	2,240
Beyond Parental Control	1,254	351	49	4	3	1,661
Status Offense - Other	444	74	12	0	0	530
Muni - Curfew	158	113	1	0	0	272
Muni-Possession / Use Of A Tobacco Product	41	4	3	1	0	49
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,445</b>	<b>2,757</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>12,645</b>

Table 4-3 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Age

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common type of referral for youth of all ages. Youth aged 15-16 was the group most often referred for Truancy [28%, 1,436]. The youth older than 17 were proportionally more likely to be referred for being Habitually Absent from Home [25%, 386]. Also, youth younger than the age of 12 were proportionally more likely to be referred for being Beyond Parental Control [16%, 361].

Missing Data [5]

<b>Allegation/Age</b>	<b>&lt;10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>&gt;=18</b>	<b>Total</b>
Behavior Injurious to Self/Others	281	166	250	423	688	881	831	826	587	39	4,972
Truancy	103	39	73	203	377	599	691	745	182	27	3,039
Habitually Absent from Home	31	16	43	149	241	416	521	458	351	35	2,261
Beyond Parental Control	54	62	90	155	212	309	331	312	148	7	1,680
Status Offense - Other	22	15	17	42	64	83	97	100	95	4	539
Muni - Curfew	0	0	6	6	33	45	67	76	43	2	278
Muni- Possession / Use of A Tobacco Product	0	0	0	2	1	8	18	9	10	1	49
<b>Total</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>1,616</b>	<b>2,341</b>	<b>2,556</b>	<b>2,526</b>	<b>1,416</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>12,818</b>

Figure 4-4 Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken

The vast majority of status offense referrals [94%, 12,001] were disposed through the informal process, leaving only 6% [805] to be disposed through the formal court process. Remaining cases are missing outcome information.

Missing Data [17]

**Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken**





Figure 4-5 Status Offense Referrals by Outcome

Informal Adjustment, No Action [29%, 3,741] was the most frequently used method for disposing status referrals, followed by Informal Adjustment without Supervision [22%, 2,817]. Allegation True with In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal outcome [3%, 386].

Missing Data [17]

\*Formal outcomes

**Status Offense Referrals by Outcome**



## Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals

Section 5 describes child abuse and neglect (CA/N) referrals disposed by Missouri’s juvenile and family division. CA/N referrals made up 29% of all referrals in calendar 2022. A CA/N referral is counted as a single event, represented by the most serious allegation where a youth is the victim. However, a youth may be the victim of multiple incidences of abuse and/or neglect at the time at which they are referred.

Table 5-1 Source of CA/N Referrals

Roughly 59% of all CA/N referrals are from Children’s Division (CD) of Missouri’s Department of Social Services (DSS). Law enforcement agencies (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement) were responsible for 13% of the referrals. Approximately 7% of the referrals originated from schools (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined).

Missing Data [338]

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage
Children’s Division	7,253	59.4%
Municipal Police	1,107	9.1%
Parent	823	6.7%
School Personnel	770	6.3%
Juvenile Court Personnel	750	6.1%
Other	497	4.1%
County Sheriff	380	3.1%
Other Juvenile Court	216	1.8%
Private Social Agency	128	1.0%
School Resource Officer	122	1.0%
Other Law Enforcement	80	0.7%
Other Relative	35	0.3%
Highway Patrol	34	0.3%
Public Social Agency	10	0.1%
Victim or Self	7	0.1%
Department of Mental Health	4	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,216</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 5-1 CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type

Neglect-Improper Care/Supervision represented [42%, 5,324] most of all CA/N referrals, followed by Neglect-Other [17%, 2,066], and Abuse-Physical [9%, 1,096]

Missing Data [0]




Figure 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Sex

Within sex, the percentage of neglect related referrals were higher for males [70%, 4,243] than for females [67%, 4,287]. Conversely, referrals for abuse were greater for females [20%, 1,310] compared with their male counterparts [16%, 961].

Missing Data [31]




Table 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race

Neglect was the most common type of referral for all youth [68%, 8,269]. Proportionately, Asian/Pacific Islander youth were the most likely group to be referred for abuse [21%, 18].

Missing Data [369]

**Note:** Missing Data includes the Unknown race option

<b>Race/Allegation</b>	<b>Juvenile Abuse</b>	<b>Juvenile Custody</b>	<b>Juvenile Neglect</b>	<b>Total</b>
White	1,744	1,292	6,198	9,234
Black	407	321	1,680	2,408
Hispanic	65	43	303	411
Native American	4	9	35	48
Asian/Pacific Islander	18	13	53	84
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,238</b>	<b>1,678</b>	<b>8,269</b>	<b>12,185</b>

Table 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age

The vast majority of abuse, neglect, and custody referrals were for youth younger than 10 [60%, 7,497].

Missing Data [11]

<b>Age/Allegation</b>	<b>Juvenile Abuse</b>	<b>Juvenile Custody</b>	<b>Juvenile Neglect</b>	<b>Total</b>
< 10	1,067	1,078	5,352	7,497
10	97	72	393	562
11	125	58	408	591
12	137	87	439	663
13	172	95	448	715
14	215	86	479	780
15	197	101	440	738
16	160	82	378	620
17	100	59	198	357
>= 18	7	5	8	20
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,277</b>	<b>1,723</b>	<b>8,543</b>	<b>12,543</b>

Figure 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Action Taken

Fifty percent of CA/N referrals were disposed through the formal court process [6,308]. Forty seven percent [5,897] of referrals were handled through the informal court process. The remainder were missing data.

Missing Data [349]

**Action Taken for Child Abuse & Neglect Referrals**




Figure 5-4 CA/N Referrals by Outcome


Allegation True, Out-of-Home Placement was the most frequently applied outcome [43%, 5,378] to CA/N referrals, followed by Transfer to Other Agency [14%, 1,705], and Referral Rejected [13%, 1,655]

Missing Data [350]

\*Formal outcomes



## Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals by Outcome



## Section 6: Assessment & Classification

In 1995, the Missouri General Assembly passed the Juvenile Crime and Crime Prevention Bill [HB 174]. The bill was aimed at reshaping Missouri’s juvenile justice system through the development of a comprehensive juvenile justice strategy. As part of the strategy, the Office of State Courts Administrator was charged with coordinating an effort to design and implement a standardized assessment process for classifying juvenile offenders. The result of this effort was the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System.

The Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System includes an empirically validated risk assessment for estimating a youthful offender’s relative likelihood of future delinquency and a classification matrix that links the level of risk and offense severity to a recommended set of graduated sanctions. The system also includes a needs assessment for identifying the underlying psychosocial needs of youth.

Since its inception, the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification system has helped Missouri's juvenile justice professionals to ensure public safety and promote statewide consistency in the services and supervision of youthful offenders.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) sections 2.6 Risk Assessment and 2.7 Needs Assessment mandates the juvenile officer complete a Missouri Juvenile Officer Risk Assessment and Missouri Juvenile Officer Needs Assessment on "all juveniles with a legally sufficient referral for a delinquent or status offense if an informal adjustment conference was conducted, or the matter was subject to adjudication." Subsequent risk assessments are to be completed "if the juvenile receiving services is subject to a new delinquent or status offense referral, and additional sanctions or services will be required." Subsequent needs assessments are to be completed "upon significant changes in the juvenile's circumstances or every 90 days as an indicator of progress toward the supervision or treatment goals."

Section 6 presents information on juveniles with referrals who were disposed during calendar 2022, and who had risk and needs assessments entered on the **Custom Assessment Maintenance (CZAASMT)** form of JIS. When a referral has more than one associated risk/needs assessment(s), the highest score is reported. When a referral is not associated with any risk/needs assessment(s) in the reporting year, the score associated with the risk/needs assessment that was completed on the nearest date before or after the initial filing date of the referral is the one that is reported, regardless of the year the assessment was completed. Figures 6-1 to 6-3 provide risk level information with Tables 6-1 and 6-2 providing information about the prevalence of individual risk and need factors. \*\*

*\*\*Readers should refer to [Missouri's Juvenile Offender Risk & Needs Assessment and Classification System Manual \(2005\)](#) for the operational definitions of risk and needs factors.*

Figure 6-1 Risk by Level

The majority of youth [61%, 6,869] scored at moderate risk for future delinquent acts on risk assessments in CY22. The remaining youth scored at low [24%, 2,684] or high-risk levels [16%, 1,773].

Missing Data [0]




Figure 6-2 Risk Level by Sex

Proportionately, more male youth [17%, 1,298] were assessed high risk than females [12%, 473]. Females [64%, 2,428] were more likely than their male counterparts [59%, 4,426] to be assessed moderate risk. Low Risk equally assessed amongst male [24%, 1,772] and females [24%, 902]

Missing Data [27]





Figure 6-3 Risk Level by Race

Proportionately, more black youth [20%, 528] were assessed high risk than white youth [14%, 1,183]. White youth [25%, 2,024] were more likely than their black counterparts [20%, 533] to be assessed low risk.

Missing Data [94]



Tables 6-1 Risk Factors

Missing [28]

<b>Age at First Referral</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
12 and under	3,885	34.3
13	1,758	15.5
14	1,871	16.5
15	1,659	14.6
16	2,125	18.8

<b>Prior Referrals</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
None	5,151	45.5
One or more	6,147	54.3

<b>Assault Referrals</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No prior or present referrals for assault	8,077	71.3
One or more prior or present referrals for misdemeanor assault	2,510	22.2
One or more prior or present referrals for felony assault	7,11	6.3

<b>History of Placement</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No prior out-of-home placement	7,855	69.4
Prior out-of-home placement	3,443	30.4

<b>Peer Relationships</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Neutral influence	6,058	53.5
Negative influence	4,231	37.4
Strong negative influence	1,009	8.9

<b>History of Child Abuse/Neglect</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No history of child abuse/neglect	8,295	73.2
History of child abuse/neglect	3,003	26.5

<b>Substance Abuse</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No alcohol or drug abuse problem is apparent	7,987	70.5
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	2,873	25.4
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	438	3.9

<b>School Attendance/Disciplinatory</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No or only minor problems	4,967	43.9
Moderate problems	4,407	38.9
Severe problems	1,924	17.0

<b>Parental Management Style</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Effective management style	5,310	46.9
Moderately effective management style	4,686	41.4
Severely ineffective management style	1,302	11.5

<b>Parental History of Incarceration</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No prior incarceration	7,862	69.4
Prior incarceration	3,436	30.3

Tables 6-2 Need Factors

Missing [98]

<b>Behavior Problems</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No significant behavior problem	4,279	38.4
Moderate behavior problem	5,091	45.7
Severe behavior problem	1,663	14.9

<b>Attitude</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Motivated to change/accepts responsibility	7,180	64.5
Generally uncooperative, defensive, not motivated to change	3,032	27.2
Very negative attitude, defiant, and resistant to change	821	7.4

<b>Interpersonal Skills</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Good interpersonal skills	6,929	62.2
Moderately impaired interpersonal skills	3,618	32.5
Severely impaired interpersonal skills	486	4.4

<b>Peer Relationships</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Neutral influence	5,871	52.7
Negative Influence	4,217	37.9
Strong negative Influence	945	8.5

<b>History of Child Abuse/Neglect</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No history child abuse/neglect	8,036	72.2
History of child abuse/neglect	2,997	26.9

<b>Mental Health</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No mental health disorder	6,979	62.7
Mental health disorder with treatment	3,191	28.7
Mental health disorder with no treatment	863	7.8

<b>Substance Abuse</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No alcohol or drug abuse problem is apparent	7,793	70.0
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	2,813	25.3
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	427	3.8

<b>School Attendance</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No or only minor problems	4,869	43.7
Moderate problems	4,302	38.6
Severe problems	1,862	16.7

<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Passing without difficulty	5,666	50.9
Functioning below average	3,485	31.3
Failing	1,882	16.9

<b>Learning Disorder</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No diagnosed learning disorder	9,398	84.4
Diagnosed learning disorder	1,635	14.7

<b>Employment</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Full-time employment	748	6.7
Part-time employment	800	7.2
Unemployed	1,350	12.1
Not Applicable	8,135	73.1



<b>Juvenile's Parental Responsibility</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No children	10,688	96.0
One child	193	1.7
Two children	86	0.8
Three or more children	66	0.6

<b>Health/Handicaps</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No health problems or physical handicaps	10,607	95.3
No health problems/handicaps but limited access to health care	108	1.0
Mild physical handicap or medical condition	267	2.4
Pregnancy	20	0.2
Serious physical handicap or medical condition	31	0.3

<b>Parental Management Style</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Effective management style	5,195	46.7
Moderately ineffective management style	4,561	41.0
Severely ineffective management style	1,277	11.5

<b>Parental Mental Health</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No parental history of mental health disorder	8,664	77.8
Parental history of mental health disorder	2,369	21.3

<b>Parental Substance Abuse</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No parental substance abuse	8,318	74.7
Parental substance abuse	2,715	24.4

<b>Social Support System</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strong social support system	5,619	50.5
Limited support system, with one positive role model	4,422	39.7
Weak support system; no positive role models	857	7.7
Strong negative or criminal influence	135	1.2

## Section 7: Detention

Missouri's juvenile and family division of the circuit court includes 18 detention facilities to house youth in need of secure detention. Juvenile justice personnel identify offenders most in need of secure detention using the objective criteria contained in Missouri's Juvenile Detention Assessment (JDTA). In addition, 17 detention centers participate in the Annie Casey Foundation Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) [highlighted in table 7-1] for calendar 2022. [The 32nd circuit also participates in JDAI, but does not have detention centers.] JDAI is an effort to assist the juvenile and family division with the development and use of community-based alternatives to secure detention when detention is determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate. The initiative emphasizes the collection and application of objective data to identify practices that may contribute to over-utilization of secure detention, detention overcrowding, and disproportionate minority confinement. On February 18, 2014 the Supreme Court of Missouri adopted the "Standards for Operation of a Secure Juvenile Detention Facility" which then became effective on January 1, 2015 that guides detention policy and practices.

Section 7 presents admission, discharge, population, and length of stay information entered on the **Custom Room Facility Assignment (CZAROOM)** form of JIS for Missouri's secure detention facilities. Depending on the reporting objective, counts are based on admissions or discharges; a single youth may be counted multiple times if they were detained on more than one occasion.

Please note that as of August 2021, youth that are certified to stand trial as an adult shall be held in detention facilities. Those youth are separated out from the rest of the detention counts. They are represented in separate charts beginning with Figure 7-16 in this section.

Table 7-1 State Youth Population August 31, 2022

Metropolitan circuits [16, 21, & 22] account for roughly 57% of all youth detained in Missouri on the last day of August 2022.

Circuit	Population	Percent MO Youth Detained
2	3	1.9%
5	2	1.2%
7	6	3.7%
11	5	3.1%
13	13	8.0%
16	21	13.0%
17	3	1.9%
19	3	1.9%
21	41	25.3%
22	30	18.5%
23	4	2.5%
24	6	3.7%
26	5	3.1%
29	4	2.5%
31	5	3.1%
33	6	3.7%
44	5	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 7-1 State Youth Admissions by Sex

There were 2,339 admissions to secure detention facilities in CY22. Males [1,894] accounted for 80% of these admissions. Females accounted for 20% [439].

Missing Data [6]




Figure 7-2 State Youth Admissions by Race

White youth accounted for 47% [1,093] of admissions to secure detention facilities while black youth accounted for 48% [1,124]. Hispanic youth accounted for 3% [76] of admissions, while Asian/Pacific Islander youth [3] and Native American youth [5] accounted for less than 1% combined.

Missing Data [38]




Figure 7-3 State Youth Admissions by Sex and Race

Among male detainees, black males accounted for the largest number of admissions to secure detention facilities [51%, 959], followed by white males [45%, 843]. Among female detainees, white females accounted for the largest percentage of admissions to a detention center [57%, 250], followed by black females [38%, 165].

Missing data [38]




Figure 7-4 State Youth Admissions by Age Group

Youth between the ages of 15 and 16 years accounted for the majority of admissions [47%, 1,110], followed by ages 13-14 [22%, 503]. The age groups of 17 years or older [29%, 669] and 12 years or younger [2%, 54] accounted for the lowest percentage of admissions across age groups.

Missing Data [3]




Figure 7-5 State Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group

Male youth, 15 to 16 years old, represented the greatest number of admissions to detention facilities [38%, 892].

Missing Data [6]




Figure 7-6 State Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group

White youth, 15 to 16 years old, represented the greatest number of admissions to detention facilities [22.8%, 533], followed by black youth of the same age group [22.6%, 528].

Missing Data [38]




Figure 7-7 State Youth Average Daily Population by Sex

The statewide average daily detention population was 161 youth. The vast majority [140, 87%] of these detainees were male.

Missing Data [6]




Figure 7-8 State Youth Average Daily Population by Race

The statewide average daily population for black youth [97] in secure detention was greater than all other youth combined [64].

Missing Data [39]




Figure 7-9 State Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race

Within sex, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for black males [87]. For the female population, black detainees also had the highest average daily detention population [11].

Missing Data [39]






Figure 7-10 State Youth Average Daily Population by Age Group

Within age groups, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for 15-16 year old youth [76], followed by 17 years old or older youth [52]. The average daily population was the lowest for ages 12 and younger [3].

Missing Data [2]




Figure 7-11 State Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex

The statewide average length of stay in detention facilities was 27 days for males and 17 days for females.

Missing Data [6]




Figure 7-12 State Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race

Statewide, black youth had the longest average length of stay of 31 days. Native American youth had the longest median length of stay of 22 days.

Missing Data [37]




Figure 7-13 State Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide average length of stay was longest for Black males at 32 days. Also, Black females at 22 days was the longest average length of stay amongst females in detention.

Missing Data [37]




Figure 7-14 State Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide median length of stay was longest for Native American males [23 days]. The second longest median length was for black males [15 days].

Missing Data [37]




Figure 7-15 State Youth Median Length of Stay by Age Group

Youth between the age of 17 years old or older represented the longest average length of stay [28 days]. The average length of stay for the 13 and 14 year old youths was the shortest [20 days].

Missing Data [10]




Figure 7-16 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex

There were 47 certified youth admissions to secure detention facilities in CY22. Males [46] accounted for 98% of these admissions. Females accounted for 2% [1].




Figure 7-17 Certified Youth Admissions by Race

White youth accounted for 43% [20] of certified youth admissions to secure detention facilities while black youth accounted for 55% [26].




Figure 7-18 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Race

Among male detainees, black males accounted for the largest number of admissions to secure detention facilities [56%, 26], followed by white males [43%, 20]. There was only one female certified youth detained.




Figure 7-19 Certified Youth Admissions by Age Group

Youth 17 years or older [66%, 31] and 15-16 years or younger [34%, 16] accounted for all of certified youth admissions across age groups.

Missing Data [3]




Figure 7-20 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group

Male youth, 17 or older, represented the greatest number of certified youth admissions to detention facilities [66%, 31].




Figure 7-21 Certified Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group

Black youth, 17 or older, represented the greatest number of certified youth admissions to detention facilities [45%, 21].




Figure 7-22 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex

The statewide average daily detention population was 19 youth. The vast majority [17.7, 94%] of these detainees were male.




Figure 7-23 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Race

The statewide average daily population for black youth [12] in secure detention was greater than all other youth combined [6].




Figure 7-24 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race

Within sex, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for black males [11]. For the female population, white detainees had the highest average daily detention population [1].




Figure 7-25 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Age

Within age groups, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for 15-16-year old youth [11], followed by 17 years old or older youth [8].






Figure 7-26 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex

The statewide average length of stay in detention facilities for certified youth was 105 days for males and 184 days for females.




Figure 7-27 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race

Statewide, black youth had the longest average length of stay of 121 days and the longest median length of stay of 65 days.




Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide average length of stay was longest for white females at 384 days. Black males at 119 days was the longest average length of stay amongst males in detention.




Figure 7-29 Certified Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide median length of stay was longest for white females [384 days]. The second longest median length was for black females [157 days].





Figure 7-30 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Age

Youth between the age of 15-16 years old or older represented the longest average length of stay [154 days] and longest median length of stay [106 days]



## Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments

Section 8 presents demographic information on youth committed to the Division of Youth Services (DYS) identified by a docket entry of DDYS – Committed to DHS on the **Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)** form of JIS in calendar 2022. For circuit level information on these commitments, refer to Appendix M. Assuming commitments to DHS are entered into JIS only once for a youth, the count is unduplicated. (**Note:** Docket entries in JIS produce data different from that historically reported by DHS.)

Figure 8-1 Statewide DHS Commitments by Sex and Race

There were 420 youths committed to the custody of DHS in CY22. The majority [87%, 363] were male. White youth accounted for 61% [255] of juveniles committed to DHS, while black youth accounted for 34% [143]. The remaining 5% [19] were Hispanic.

Missing Data [3]





Figure 8-2 Statewide DHS Commitments by Age Group

Forty-nine percent [204] of youth committed to DHS were between the ages of 15 and 16. An additional 21% [87] were between 13-14 years of age. Youth younger than 12 years accounted for less than 1% [7], while 29% [122] of youth were aged 17 or older.

Missing Data [0]



Tables 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex, Race, and Age Group

White males age 17 [59] were the most common group committed to DYS. This was more than all females combined [54]. Males age 18 or older had the same amount of commitments for black youth [5] and white youth [5]. Also, male 12 or younger had the same amount of commitments for black [3] and white youth [3]. All other age groups had more white youth commitments than minority youth in CY22.

Missing Data [3]

**Male youth**

Age/Race	White	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian/Pacific Islander
<=12	3	3	0	0	0
13	9	7	2	0	0
14	36	14	2	0	0
15	46	33	5	0	0
16	55	30	6	0	0
17	59	39	4	0	0
>=18	5	5	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Female Youth**

Age/Race	White	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian/Pacific Islander
<=12	1	0	0	0	0
13	7	0	0	0	0
14	8	2	0	0	0
15	11	2	0	0	0
16	8	5	0	0	0
17	7	3	0	0	0
>=18	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Section 9: Certification to Adult Court

Section 9 presents demographic information about youth certified to adult court, identified by the docket entry of DJVCA - JUV Certified to Adult Court on the **Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)** form of JIS in calendar 2022. For additional circuit level information about these certifications, refer to Appendix N. Assuming certifications are entered into JIS only once for a youth, the count presented is unduplicated.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 5.4 Certification mandates “the juvenile officer shall consider the implications of certification and consider certification only in circumstances in which issues of public safety cannot be mitigated by supervision and services in the juvenile justice system.”

Figure 9-1 Certifications by Sex

The statewide total for offenders certified to adult court was 78. Majority were males [94%, 76].

Missing Data [1]




Figure 9-2 Certifications by Race

The percentage of offenders certified to adult court was greater for black youth [55%, 43] than for white youth [40%, 31].

Missing Data [0]




Figure 9-3 Certifications by Age

The largest portions of offenders certified to adult courts were 18 years or older [44%, 34] and 17 years old [38%, 30]. Fourteen percent [11] were 16 years old and the remaining 4% [3] were 15 years old.

Missing Data [0]





Figure 9-4 Certifications Trends by Race

Since 2012, the number of black offenders certified to adult courts has increased 26% and the number of white offenders increased by 55%.

From 2021 to 2022, the total number of certifications roughly doubled. There were 4 offenders of the other races certified in 2022 compared to 0 in 2021.

This data may have been influenced by the raise the age legislation which went into effect July 2021. This legislation allowed juvenile offenders up to the age of 17 to be processed in juvenile courts.





## Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism

Juvenile divisions across the country are being asked to provide evidence that public funds are used in cost-effective ways to reduce and prevent juvenile crime. For Missouri juvenile divisions to measure progress in this area, the following statewide definition of juvenile offender recidivism was developed through consensus:

*“A juvenile offender recidivist is any youth, referred to the juvenile office for a legally sufficient law violation during a calendar year, who receives one or more legally sufficient law violation(s) to the juvenile or adult court within one year of the initial referral’s disposition date.”*

Section 10 presents the demographic and offense characteristics that influenced recidivism rates for the calendar 2021 cohort of Missouri juvenile law offenders who were tracked through calendar 2022 for recidivism. Note that recidivism is tracked by the offender’s party id entered in JIS and is only tracked if the new offense occurs in the same circuit as the original offense.

Figure 10-1 Missouri Youth Offender Population

Approximately 0.5% [5,836] of the 1,081,787 juveniles aged 5-17 were referred to Missouri's juvenile and family division for legally sufficient law violation referrals in CY21.

**Offender Population as a Proportion of Missouri Youth**




Figure 10-2 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (All Law)

Approximately 22% [1,274] of the 5,836 juvenile law offenders in CY21 recidivated through a new law violation within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.

**Percentage of Youth Recidivating**




Figure 10-3 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Misdemeanor A or Felony)

Roughly 15% [885] of the 5,836 juvenile law offenders in CY21 recidivated either with a new Class A misdemeanor or felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.

**Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felonies or Misdemeanor A)**




Figure 10-4 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony)

Eight percent [468] of the 5,836 juvenile law offenders in CY21 recidivated with a felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.

**Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony Charges)**




Figure 10-5 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year

The percentage of the recidivists with any law violation increased by 2.2% between the 2020 cohort and the 2021 cohort. The percent of youth who recidivated with either a Class A misdemeanor or felony increased 1.4% from CY20 cohort. The percentage of youth recidivating with a felony increased by 0.5% from CY20 cohort.




Figure 10-6 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex

Males [23.7%, 969] from the CY21 cohort recidivated at a higher rate than their female [17.5%, 305] counterparts. This holds true for those who recidivated with either Class A misdemeanor or felony offense, as well as for those who recidivated with only a felony offense.




Figure 10-7 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race

Proportionately, black youth [27%, 437] from the CY21 cohort had a higher rate of recidivism than their other minority counterparts [19%, 40] and white counterparts [20%, 792] for all law referrals. The same holds true for referrals for felonies with class A misdemeanors, as well as all felony charges.




Figure 10-8 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type

Recidivism from CY21 for all law violations was higher for youth in multi-county circuits [22.5%, 784] than for youth in single county circuits, [20.8%, 490]. However, the percentages were higher for Class A misdemeanors and felonies [16.2%, 381] in single county circuits than in multi-county circuits [14.5%, 504], and also higher for just felony referrals in single county circuits [9.4%, 222] than in multi-county circuits [7.1%, 246].





Figure 10-9 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age

The percentage of recidivism is highest for youth between the ages of 13 and 14 years for all types of offenses, except felony only charges. Proportionally, youth 17 years or older had a higher recidivism rate for felonies [10%, 80].



## Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED)

RED is one of four core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended in 2002. All states are required by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to make efforts to document and reduce RED. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was reauthorized in 2018, also known as the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018. One of its key components is to further determine if there are racial and ethnic disparities (RED) identified within in the juvenile justice system and actively work to address those issues by identifying and analyzing data on race and ethnicity at decision points in State, local or tribal juvenile justice systems to determine which such points create racial and ethnic disparities among youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Disproportionate minority contact occurs whenever the overall volume of activity for minority youth at various juvenile justice contact points is disproportionately larger than the volume of activity for white youth at those points. It is important to examine *all* juvenile justice contact points due to the likelihood that minority youth will penetrate deeper into the juvenile justice system as a result of disproportionate minority contact with the system. Racial and ethnic disparities further involve the unfair or inequitable treatment of youth of color at those decision points in the juvenile justice system due to various reasons.

The existence of disproportionality does not necessarily mean that minority youth are experiencing disparity (or unequal treatment), because further analysis is needed to determine whether or not disproportionality is a consequence of disparities and/or other contributing mechanisms.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 1.15 Antidiscrimination and Disproportionate Minority Contact mandates “the juvenile officer shall prohibit discrimination and proactively address racial and ethnic disparities to ensure fundamental fairness and equal justice for those served by the juvenile office.”

## What is a Relative Rate Index (RRI)?

The data analysis of the OJJDP Relative Rate Index (RRI) compares the relative volume of activity (rate) for eight court contact points for each minority youth group with the volume of activity (rate) for the majority group (white youth). It provides a single index number that indicates the extent to which the volume of contact differs.

Because the Relative Rate Index is intended to capture the overall extent of youth involvement with the juvenile justice system, the RRI calculation is based on *cases*, not individual *youth*. If a youth is referred to the juvenile court multiple times during the course of a single year, all of those referrals are included. Therefore, the data provided include ***duplicated*** counts for all court contact points.

Example: The RRI comparing rates of referral to juvenile court:

Rate of Referral for black youth:

<u># of black youth referred:</u>	$\frac{150}{500} = 0.30 \times 1000 = 300$
# of black youth in population	500

Rate of Referral for white youth:

<u># of white youth referred:</u>	$\frac{200}{5000} = 0.04 \times 1000 = 40$
# of white youth in population	5000

Relative Rate Calculation for Referrals:

<u>Rate of Referral for black youth:</u>	$\frac{300}{40} = 7.5$ RRI
Rate of Referral for white youth	40

If the RRI is larger than 1.0, that means that the minority group experiences contact more often than white youth. If it is less than 1.0, that means that contact is less frequent. In this example, the RRI for black referrals is 7.5. This means that black youth are seven and a half times more likely to be referred to the juvenile office than white youth.



With the exception of the first rate (referral), which is calculated using the base of the number of youth in each major racial/ethnic grouping in the general population, each of the subsequent RRIs is calculated based on the volume of activity for that racial/ethnic group in a proceeding stage in the case process. See Table 11-1.

Table 11-1 Identifying the Numerical Bases for Rate Calculations

<b>Decision Stage / Contact Point</b>	<b>Base for Rates</b>
Referrals to Juvenile Court	Rate per 1,000 Population
Referrals Diverted	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Involving Secure Detention	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Petitioned	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Resulting in Delinquency Findings	Rate per 100 Petitions
Referrals Resulting in Supervision / Probation Placement	Rate per 100 Delinquency Findings
Referrals Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	Rate per 100 Delinquency Findings
Referrals Transferred to Adult Court	Rate per 100 Petitions Filed

Table 11-2 Relative Rate Index (RRI) Values

More than 1.00	Referrals to Juvenile Court Referrals Involving Secure Detention Referrals Petitioned Referrals Resulting in Delinquency Findings Referrals Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities Referrals Transferred to Adult Court
Less than 1.00	Referrals Diverted Referrals Resulting in Supervision / Probation Placement

**Note:** RRI values that cause RED concern can be greater than 1.00 or less than 1.00.

#### **What Data are Used?**

- U.S. Census data for youth ages 10-17 in all counties in Missouri.
- Census data from the previous calendar year was used, because the Census population updates for the current year are not available at the time of publication.
- Office of State Courts Administrator delinquency data in the Judicial Information System (JIS). Law violation referrals and status referrals (but not child abuse and neglect referrals) were included.
- Transfers to other juvenile court referrals were not included

Table 11-3 Statewide Relative Rate Indices

Black youth experienced the largest disproportionality overall. Black youth were over-represented at referral, while Hispanic and Asian /Pacific Islander youth were under-represented at that contact point. Black youth also experienced negative disproportionality at: diversion, secure detention, petition, and cases transferred to adult court.

Contact Point	Black	Hispanic	Asian / Pacific Islander	Native American
Referral	<b>2.13</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.21</b>	*
Diversion	<b>0.92</b>	0.96	1.12	*
Secure Detention	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.80</b>	**	*
Petition	<b>1.53</b>	<b>1.30</b>	**	*
Delinquent Findings	<b>0.85</b>	0.87	**	*
Supervision	1.04	1.10	**	*
Secure Confinement	<b>0.73</b>	1.41	NA	*
Certification	<b>3.89</b>	**	NA	*

Statistically significant results

**Bold Font**


Group is less than 1% of youth population \*

Insufficient number of cases for analysis \*\*

**Note:** Caution should be used when interpreting the Hispanic data, because race and ethnicity are not separated in JIS. Thus, Hispanic youth are under-counted.

Figure 11-1 Ten-Year Trend of Statewide RRI for Referrals of Black Youth

While the number of referrals has declined over the last decade, the RRI for referrals of black youth has remained relatively steady with the highest in 2013 at 2.3 and the lowest in 2018 and 2021 at 1.9. The reason for this is that, although referrals declined for all youth from 2012 to 2021, they did not do so evenly across groups in each year.



## Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload

The Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload (JOWWL) system is an automated means of estimating the direct service need for additional deputy juvenile officers in Missouri's 35 multi-county circuits. The JOWWL compares the number of staff hours required to screen and process the status, law, and CA/N referrals received by juvenile divisions and to supervise youth in accordance with the **Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards**, against the actual number of staff hours available to complete these direct service activities. When workload demand exceeds the number of staff hours available to meet it, a need for additional direct service personnel is projected. The Circuit Court Budget Committee (CCBC) adopted and first used the results of the JOWWL for estimating FTE needs for juvenile officers in fiscal 2004. The CCBC has since used the JOWWL annually for this budgetary purpose. In January of 2020 a new workload study was conducted by the National Center for State Courts, and a new model was delivered the summer of 2020. The new model adjusted workload weights for various case processing activities and eliminated the Alternatives to Detention case processing category.

### Example of Workload Estimate for Mock Multi-County Circuit

**Annual Case-Specific Workload:** Annual total work minutes required to service juvenile cases at established standards includes screening, processing and supervising delinquency and CA/N cases, based on workload values identified by the 2020 juvenile officer workload study [Table 12-1].

*Example: Mock Circuit, 255,314 minutes of direct service work are required to accommodate case management demand.*

**Staffing Demand:** Total number of direct service staff needed to meet Annual Case-Specific Workload. (Annual available work minutes per Juvenile Office is 75,761)

*Example: Mock Circuit, Total Annual Case-Specific Workload / 75,761 mnts. = Staffing Demand (255,314 / 75,761 mnts. = 3.4 direct service staff needed).*

**Circuit FTE:** Total number of direct service staff currently employed by circuit.

*Example: Mock Circuit employs 2 direct service staff. Currently this includes all state-paid DJO I, II & III positions and all full-time staff paid through DYS diversion grant funds.*

**FTE Need:** Additional direct service staff needed to service Total Workload Hours per standards.

*Example: Mock Circuit, Staffing Demand – Circuit FTE = FTE Need (3.4 - 2.0 = 1.4 additional direct service staff).*

Table 12-1 Workload Values per Year from Juvenile Officer Workload Study (2020)

Diversion

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Diversion	639.24

Status Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1243.58
Informal Processing	4521.62
Informal Supervision	1021.78
Formal Processing	5040.46
Formal Supervision: All risk levels	2084.64
Truancy Court	1849.89

Law Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1522.67
Informal Processing	4838.43
Informal Supervision	783.48
Formal Processing	16761.28
Formal Supervision: All risk levels	3296.88
Juvenile Treatment Court	2116.20

Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N) Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1383
Informal Processing	8942.14
Informal Supervision	1125.96
Formal Processing	13055.17
Formal Supervision and out-of-home placement	367.30
Protections Orders	261.60
Family Treatment Court	873.07

Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening	1333.13
Court Related Activity	1333.13

Table 12-2 Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload

January 2022 Monthly Workload JIS Counts																										
Circuit	Types	Status Cases				Law Cases				CANN Cases				TPR Cases	Annual Case-Specific Workload	Circuit FTE	Staffing Demand	Additional or Subtracted FTE Need	Positive Staffing Need Only							
		Screening (Informal/Formal)	Internal processing	Internal supervision	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing							Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	Formal processing	
1	118	4.3	14.6	1.8	18.6	2.3	0.6	2.1	1.0	12.6	5.0	0.6	0.1	3.3	95.1	3.1	0.1	1.4	254,930	3	3.37	0.37	0.37	1		
2	16.2	9.7	2.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	11.4	3.0	12.4	1.0	5.8	1.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	7.0	148.8	6.0	17.0	0.5	1.2	3.88	-0.12	0.00	2	
3	11.8	2.8	12.3	0.3	1.2	10.2	2.5	13.4	3.5	10.5	14.3	2.8	12.1	2.9	72.0	4.7	0.2	1.1	300,885	4	3.97	-0.03	0.00	3		
4	19.6	8.3	28.1	1.1	2.4	7.6	3.9	11.4	1.2	3.8	16.3	2.6	9.5	5.9	78.3	1.4	0.3	0.5	336,213	4	4.44	0.44	0.44	4		
5	4.0	44.3	24.2	3.5	2.2	10.6	0.0	20.2	6.5	5.8	4.0	45.5	15.9	0.0	0.0	6.9	85.9	17.6	0.3	3.3	640,443	9	8.46	-0.54	0.00	5
8	5.4	4.0	6.2	0.1	0.7	1.6	7.3	5.5	2.5	6.3	1.6	7.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	12.7	4.1	0.1	0.0	116,052	1	1.53	0.53	0.53	8	
9	3.7	10.2	1.8	8.1	0.4	6.7	1.6	0.0	0.3	0.8	1.3	5.4	0.3	1.2	3.9	62.5	3.3	0.5	3.1	150,872	3	1.99	-1.01	0.00	9	
10	12.3	4.2	52.3	0.7	2.0	0.0	13.8	4.1	65.9	3.0	4.2	3.8	0.1	0.0	3.2	65.4	11.4	1.1	4.3	333,059	6	4.40	-1.60	0.00	10	
12	67.1	6.8	36.0	0.9	1.5	11.4	2.7	21.6	2.3	17.3	12.8	0.8	4.3	8.2	177.5	8.2	4.8	2.3	6.4	470,068	7	6.21	-0.79	0.00	12	
13	26.1	17.4	48.3	9.9	10.6	63.7	21.8	32.4	17.3	76.1	21.2	1.7	1.0	18.3	549.4	29.3	17.8	1.8	5.7	1,571,042	18.5	20.76	2.26	2.26	13	
14	2.3	24.9	6.8	20.6	1.7	1.5	9.5	4.1	18.6	0.6	3.0	20.6	1.3	1.0	5.5	185.2	6.3	0.4	2.3	350,250	5	4.63	-0.37	0.00	14	
15	15.3	13.1	3.1	17.8	0.9	0.3	21.8	4.1	25.8	2.1	7.3	5.3	0.1	0.0	3.8	89.0	12.5	0.5	3.7	285,184	3.5	3.90	0.40	0.40	15	
17	41.3	49.7	26.0	55.8	4.3	9.6	0.0	46.7	21.2	61.3	11.5	79.1	14.9	1.2	10.7	266.6	18.8	2.0	12.3	1,271,872	12	16.81	4.81	4.81	17	
18	13.9	2.8	19.9	0.6	0.0	1.0	28.8	6.6	39.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	6.7	1.3	7.3	3.7	69.9	8.6	0.0	1.8	354,136	8	3.75	4.68	0.93	18
20	23.0	20.3	4.9	19.3	0.8	3.9	29.8	9.1	35.7	2.8	14.8	10.8	0.0	0.0	10.8	397.8	18.8	9.8	4.6	680,700	8	8.73	0.73	0.73	20	
24	10.5	2.1	1.6	0.0	0.0	22.4	6.3	2.7	3.8	19.3	10.3	0.0	0.0	9.8	466.4	12.7	31.9	10.0	4.7	632,409	9	8.36	-0.64	0.00	24	
25	82.7	53.3	41.8	2.6	12.3	24.5	12.0	25.8	3.0	12.6	79.3	18.5	0.0	21.8	553.7	18.8	1.3	11.6	1,417,211	13.5	16.73	5.23	5.23	25		
26	16.8	2.2	9.5	0.9	0.0	22.5	6.3	8.7	4.9	15.5	12.5	0.1	1.3	5.3	329.7	28.4	3.3	23.4	503,005	6.5	6.65	0.15	0.15	26		
27	9.8	10.2	8.6	23.5	0.5	2.0	8.8	6.3	26.6	0.9	8.2	17.9	11.3	11.1	5.2	159.5	7.7	2.0	5.6	472,344	6.5	6.24	-0.26	0.00	27	
28	23.4	13.0	13.3	1.3	1.1	24.3	13.6	18.3	2.0	8.9	22.6	0.3	0.1	8.1	125.9	9.8	1.4	2.0	483,121	5.5	6.38	0.88	0.88	28		
30	6.0	13.3	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.2	32.4	5.3	22.0	3.3	15.8	23.3	0.3	0.2	7.6	265.0	10.7	2.7	14.6	482,389	7	6.37	-0.63	0.00	30	
32	38.9	18.3	77.8	0.0	0.0	21.6	28.3	12.9	82.2	2.1	23.8	0.0	26.8	14.1	64.3	10.2	357.8	10.0	14.3	1,059,945	13	14.01	1.01	1.01	32	
33	224.6	15.8	6.6	11.8	0.7	0.7	26.7	29.0	8.8	27.3	4.6	9.1	9.3	1.6	6.7	6.8	168.6	4.5	11.2	0.0	0.0	9.06	0.06	0.06	33	
34	26.5	17.9	38.4	0.5	1.7	14.2	6.1	14.8	3.7	31.0	12.0	0.1	0.0	6.7	184.8	2.4	0.4	0.4	559,415	6.5	7.39	0.89	0.89	34		
35	28.3	7.3	17.7	1.0	7.8	19.2	4.5	13.8	5.3	16.5	42.2	6.1	20.0	17.8	299.8	6.7	22.3	1.5	2.8	816,753	9.5	10.79	1.29	1.29	35	
36	5.7	1.0	3.6	0.2	0.0	21.0	5.6	7.1	3.7	14.1	20.8	2.8	12.7	16.7	271.2	7.5	0.8	10.7	590,632	6	7.81	1.81	1.81	36		
37	41.3	10.1	7.5	12.7	0.3	0.0	10.4	4.6	15.4	2.1	15.1	0.0	9.3	0.0	0.5	5.7	173.9	12.5	0.0	0.0	379,811	6	5.02	-0.88	0.00	37
38	15.8	34.8	3.1	53.0	2.4	1.4	30.7	5.7	79.3	2.6	10.3	19.9	0.9	3.0	6.8	164.6	9.4	1.1	8.5	553,114	4.5	7.31	2.81	2.81	38	
39	18.1	1.4	6.5	0.0	1.3	21.3	4.0	25.5	3.5	2.1	23.0	0.0	15.8	234.3	10.5	2.0	8.4	515,768	6.5	6.82	0.32	0.32	39			
40	42.5	21.4	4.1	15.9	0.9	0.9	29.6	5.6	49.5	3.6	17.8	3.4	19.0	0.0	16.7	224.0	17.8	4.1	3.1	678,989	9	8.97	-0.03	0.00	40	
41	10.9	4.5	19.8	0.3	1.8	4.7	1.8	12.2	0.3	5.5	5.1	1.8	4.9	2.0	106.0	1.8	1.0	1.5	206,073	4	2.72	-1.28	0.00	41		
42	9.1	4.3	28.7	1.5	0.0	7.6	2.0	7.1	1.3	0.0	12.8	0.0	0.0	11.8	196.5	10.8	3.1	15.4	388,632	5.5	5.14	-0.36	0.00	42		
43	15.6	3.0	16.8	0.8	2.4	17.5	3.9	19.0	2.3	11.9	22.7	0.3	0.3	6.5	174.0	5.3	0.8	2.0	385,984	4.5	5.10	0.60	0.60	43		
44	30.2	1.8	0.8	4.0	0.2	0.0	6.7	3.8	25.8	2.0	10.1	0.0	4.0	0.0	3.7	201.4	5.9	0.3	4.2	280,333	3.5	3.70	0.20	0.20	44	
45	17.8	3.8	8.3	0.5	3.4	15.6	3.9	10.4	2.3	13.0	18.4	0.3	0.0	6.9	176.9	15.4	14.8	2.7	11.8	409,130	5	5.41	0.41	0.41	45	
46	9.8	3.0	8.4	0.6	1.2	11.9	3.1	14.4	1.3	2.7	19.3	2.6	0.7	16.0	398.4	3.3	6.8	38.0	559,566	4.5	7.39	2.89	2.89	46		
Total	476	762	286	762	41	108	49	687	218	860	115	556	12	302	7,528	366	148	62	294	19,459,551	236.75	257.16	20.41	26.14	Totals	
	34.00	21.16	7.93	21.16	1.14	2.99	7.04	19.07	6.06	23.89	3.18	15.44	1.31	16.44	4.76	8.38	208.12	10.16	12.33	1.73	8.17					

## Section 13: CA/N Time Standards

In March 2005, the Supreme Court of Missouri issued an order adopting Court Operating Rule (COR) 23.01, Reporting Requirements for Child Abuse and Neglect Cases, effective July 1, 2005. This COR requires the presiding judge in each circuit to submit a quarterly report (CA/N Quarterly) to OSCA. The CA/N Quarterly Report lists all child abuse and neglect hearings where standards were not met during the quarter. These standards are based on the requirements of Supreme Court Rule 124.01, Rules of Practice and Procedure in Juvenile Divisions and Family Court Divisions of the Circuit, which states that the following hearings shall be held:

- 1) Within three days, excluding Saturday, Sunday and legal holidays, a protective custody hearing
- 2) Within 60 days, an adjudication hearing
- 3) Within 90 days, a dispositional hearing
- 4) Every 90 to 120 days after the dispositional hearing during the first 12 months in which the juvenile is in the custody of the children's division, a dispositional review hearing
- 5) Within 12 months and at least annually thereafter, a permanency hearing
- 6) As often as necessary after each permanency hearing, but at least every six months, during the period in which the juvenile remains in the custody of the children's division, a permanency review hearing.

The data from each circuit is compiled into a final report and submitted to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Missouri and the Commission on Retirement, Removal and Discipline

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 5.7 Timeliness of Proceedings and Applicable Time Standards mandates "the juvenile officer shall ensure the timely scheduling of all hearings and not be a party to undue and unnecessary delays. Further, the juvenile officer shall comply with established time standards in the scheduling of hearings to the extent such is in control of the juvenile officer and serves the interest of justice."

Table 13-1 CA/N Hearings Held Timely

In FY22, the juvenile and family divisions conducted the required CA/N hearings in a timely fashion. Thirty-five divisions held 95% or more of their hearings on time; while at the statewide level, 94% of hearings were held timely.

Table is continued on the next page.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Hearings Held</b>	<b>Hearings Held Timely</b>	<b>Percent Held Timely</b>
1	385	385	100%
2	684	684	100%
3	284	298	95%
4	415	415	100%
5	371	371	100%
6	170	180	94%
7	622	652	95%
8	69	79	87%
9	470	477	99%
10	608	713	85%
11	1,024	1,068	96%
12	807	813	99%
13	1,965	1,995	98%
14	429	549	78%
15	315	315	100%
16	3,468	4,904	71%
17	729	735	99%
18	762	762	100%
19	581	582	100%
20	1,407	1,475	95%
21	3,966	4,384	90%
22	2,315	2,345	99%
23	2,265	2,347	97%

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Hearings Held</b>	<b>Hearings Held Timely</b>	<b>Percent Held Timely</b>
24	2,266	2,388	95%
25	2,186	2,193	100%
26	1,442	1,442	100%
27	603	606	100%
28	457	461	99%
29	1,618	1,643	98%
30	1,143	1,169	98%
31	2,959	2,976	99%
32	1,404	1,511	93%
33	732	732	100%
34	606	641	95%
35	1,173	1,199	98%
36	814	973	84%
37	576	583	99%
38	657	657	100%
39	1,417	1,421	100%
40	1,124	1,227	92%
41	369	372	99%
42	1,290	1,377	94%
43	581	616	94%
44	804	809	99%
45	731	757	97%
46	1,196	1,196	100%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>50,259</b>	<b>53,477</b>	<b>94%</b>



## Section 14: Juvenile and Family Division Programs and Diversion

Juvenile Officers across the state of Missouri provide a variety of programming to youth and their families on a daily basis to address their particular risk and needs. These programs are intended to decrease recidivism, promote accountability, enhance community safety, enhance child and family safety, and teach prosocial behaviors. The programs detailed below are programs that have been documented in the Justice Information System.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 2.4 Diversion mandates “the juvenile officer shall utilize evidence-based diversion programming whenever appropriate.” Section 3.13 Specialized Services and Treatment mandates “the juvenile officer shall provide specialized services and treatment specific to the offense, gender, and culture of the juvenile to the extent practicable based on available resources.”

These programs are categorized into several main areas listed below:

- **Accountability Programs:** These programs primarily try to teach youth how to take responsibility for their actions and empower them to develop more prosocial behaviors at home, school, and in the community.
- **Alternative Court Programs:** These are specialty court dockets or programs that are meant to address a specific problem area for youth and provide accountability, education, and resources for a specific issue.
- **Anger Management/Conflict Resolution Programs:** These programs are meant to teach youth how to effectively identify their anger and manage it appropriately in a variety of social settings.
- **Diversionary Programs:** Diversionary Programs are programs that are meant to divert youth from various entry points into the juvenile justice system. Diversion programs are divided into four levels based on the time that the offense is committed by the juvenile and when the juvenile participates in the program.
  - Level one diversion programs are used to completely prevent unnecessary referrals from coming to the juvenile office.
  - Level two diversion programs are used when the actions of a juvenile could result in a referral to the juvenile officer.

- Level three diversion programs divert youth referred to the juvenile court from formal court action into appropriate community based programs.
- Level four diversion programs divert youth referred to the juvenile office from secure confinement or commitment to the Missouri Division of Youth Services so that they can remain in the community.
- **Gender Specific Programs:** These programs provide prosocial interventions and education specific to the needs of boys or girls that are involved with the juvenile justice system.
- **Health and Fitness Programs:** These programs are meant to promote the overall health and well-being of youth referred to the juvenile justice system.
- **Mental Health Programs:** These programs provide a variety of mental health services to a youth or their family that address both the internal and external issues that may be contributing to problematic behaviors by youth.
- **Monitoring Programs:** These programs primarily monitor the whereabouts and activities of youth to promote community safety according to a youth's risk level.
- **Parenting Education and Support Programs:** These programs are meant to provide education, resources, and support to parents or guardians whose children are involved in either the juvenile justice system or child welfare system.
- **Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending Programs:** These programs are meant to provide education and support to youth referred to the court for problem sexual behaviors or sex offenses to try to prevent re-offense and promote more prosocial thought patterns.
- **Prosocial Juvenile Programs:** These programs created by juvenile officers are innovative and may fit into several categories.
- **School and Academic Related Programs:** These are programs that are meant to promote success for youth in school and the educational setting.
- **Sexual Education Programs:** These programs are meant to provide overall education and support to youth involved with the court to improve their health and who are at risk for pregnancy, sexual violence or receiving a sexually transmitted infection.
- **Substance Abuse Programs:** These are programs that are meant to provide education, treatment, and support to youth who have been referred for substance related offenses or identify as having a substance abuse problem.

- **Victim Education and Restorative Justice Programs:** These are programs that are meant to provide education to youth regarding the impact of their offense on the victim and promote empathy for the victim. These programs further provide services that are meant to restore for the victim what has been done wrong by the juvenile.
- **Vocational and Life Skills Development Programs:** These are programs that meant to teach youth skills that can help them demonstrate socially appropriate behaviors and gain and retain employment in the community.

Table 14-1 Juvenile Program Categories and the number of Participants

In CY22, there were 10,174 juveniles that participated in court sponsored programs. Monitoring was the most frequently used program category with participants [2,087, 21%]. Victim Education and Restorative Justice [1,960, 19%], Vocational or Life Skills [1,561 15%], and Mental Health [1,240, 12%], were the other most common program categories.

Missing Data [0]

Juvenile Program Categories	Number of Participants	Percent of Total
Accountability	774	7.6%
Alternative Court	159	1.6%
Anger Management / Conflict Resolution	167	1.6%
Gender Specific	266	2.6%
Health and Fitness	83	0.8%
Mental Health	1,240	12.2%
Monitoring	2,087	20.5%
Parenting Education and Support	308	3.0%
Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending	33	0.3%
Prosocial Activities	234	2.3%
School or Academic Support	370	3.6%
Sex Education	19	0.2%
Substance Abuse	913	9.0%
Victim Education and Restorative Justice	1,960	19.3%
Vocational and Life Skills Development	1,561	15.3%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>10,174</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 14-2 Juvenile Diversion Programs and the number of participants

In CY22, Juvenile Diversion Programs served 5,836 youth. A youth could have participated in more than one diversion program.

Level 1 Diversion programs were the most commonly used with 4,144 participants [71%] followed by Level 2 diversion programs with 1,525 participants [26%].

**Note:** Diversion level 1 and 2 counts are only reported in multi-county circuits. They report their counts for credit in the Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload model. Diversion 3 & 4 counts are captured through specific program codes entered in the JIS system. Those codes could be entered statewide.

Circuits might be participating in a diversion program but not reporting those counts to the Office of State Courts Administrator. Those counts will not be reflected in the following table.

Missing Data [0]

Juvenile Diversion Programs CY22	Number of Participants	Percent of Total
Level 1	4,144	71.0%
Level 2	1,525	26.1%
Level 3 and 4	167	2.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,836</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## Program Spotlights Around the State

This section highlights several programs submitted by various juvenile offices around the state and serve as examples of the wide range of beneficial programs and services available to Missouri youth involved with the juvenile justice system.

### **7<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court – Emotional and Social Development**

#### **Emotional Mayhem Program**

This is a two-week course to help juveniles understand how the brain is wired, identify triggers, and learn practical strategies on how to manage emotions. In two sessions scheduled for an hour and a half each, participants learn the states of our brain and how our behavior corresponds with them. Also, the capability to rewire our brain and choose a different way to respond to situations. The course identifies triggers to gain an understanding of the warning signs leading to emotional outbursts. Participants complete a personal action plan and commitment to managing emotional mayhem in their daily lives. This is a new program which held its first session in November of 2022. For the first class, there were eight registrations. Of these, seven participants completed the class. Since this first class, there has been enough interest to hold this class monthly. This program has received positive feedback from participants, families, and schools.

#### **Mother/Daughter Circle**

This is a four-week, two-hour course that helps mothers and daughters (ages 11-18) foster, repair, restore and rebuild their relationship. The purpose of the circle is to promote a healthy and sustaining bond between mothers and daughters during the transitional years from girlhood to young womanhood. In 2022, two sessions were held with a total of six total registrants. Four mother/daughter pairs attended at least one session. Three mother/daughter pairs completed the full program. This program has very positive feedback from mothers and daughters.

### **22<sup>nd</sup> Judicial Circuit Court – Diversion and Restorative Justice:**

#### **Neighborhood Accountability Boards**

The Neighborhood Accountability Board is a program that consists of four to seven members of the community who informally address minor delinquency matters. Neighborhood Accountability Boards offer youth the opportunity to repair the harm caused by their offense and make a positive contribution to their own community. The Neighborhood Accountability Board, operating in accordance with the guidelines of the Court, meets with the youth and guardian, as well as the victim (if the victim desires) to discuss the offense, ask questions and obtain information from the youth to formulate a plan of action. The plan of action becomes a

signed agreement when agreed upon by all parties involved. Members of Neighborhood Accountability Boards are responsible for monitoring compliance with the agreement. There are currently fourteen boards in the City of St. Louis.

### **Victim Offender Dialogue**

Victim Offender Dialogue is a face-to-face meeting, in the presence of a trained facilitator, between the victim of a crime and the person who committed that crime. In the meeting, the offender and the victim can talk to each other about what happened, the effects of the crime on their lives, and their feelings about the matter. They may choose to create a mutually agreeable plan to repair any damages that occurred as a result of the crime. Through this process, seven crime victims had an opportunity to get answers to their questions about the crime and the person who committed the offense.

### **23<sup>rd</sup> Circuit – New Day Treatment Program**

The New Day, Day Treatment Program is an alternative education program located in Hillsboro, Missouri and has become a crucial asset for the operation of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Judicial Circuit juvenile office. New Day operates in conjunction with the 23<sup>rd</sup> Judicial Circuit and under the direction of the Missouri Division of Youth Services and serves both youth under court jurisdiction as well as those who are in DYS custody. Students attend school for seven hours a day before returning home to their family in the evenings. The goals of the Day Treatment Project are to provide academics in a structured setting to “at-risk” youth, for the multi-disciplinary team to work closely with youth concerning their educational plan, and to divert at least 80% of youth referred to the program from DYS commitments. The program can accommodate students in grades 6-12 and welcomes those who are serving long term suspensions or may have Safe School Act violations.

Utilizing the Division of Youth Services core beliefs and philosophies, New Day creates Individualized Treatment Plans (ITP) for each student with goals that are optimized for each individual need. Smaller class sizes promote more one-on-one attention from teachers and youth specialists and provides greater structure and accountability. New Day also provides services such as community service and group therapy, and welcomes outside resources such as speech therapy, pickleball lessons, tutoring, conflict resolution groups, and individual therapy into their program.

New Day provides an alternative, community-based resource that ensures needed structure for at-risk youth. During the fiscal year 2022, 44 youth under the jurisdiction of the 23<sup>rd</sup> circuit court attended New Day. This number has decreased since calendar year 2020; historically, New Day has served over 50 youth annually and as many as 60 youth in 2018. Of the 44 youth under court jurisdiction that participated, over 90% were diverted from DYS commitments. The juvenile court currently has 35 youth on the waiting list for New Day services which indicates the reliance and confidence the juvenile court has in the Day Treatment Program.

### **31<sup>st</sup> Judicial Circuit Court - Quality Services Unit**

In 2022, the Greene County Juvenile Office completed the first full year of having a Quality Services unit to focus on the development of a total quality management program. This program focuses on creating continuous quality improvement feedback loops at the organizational level with the general purpose of improving direct service delivery to youth and families. The Quality Unit has served approximately 100 employees, and by extension, more than 1000 youth and families across various sectors of the juvenile office (i.e., delinquency, abuse and neglect, domestic relations, etc.). The primary objectives of the unit include building a data life cycle throughout the office which includes the following steps: 1.) Learning to ask questions; 2.) building integrated data structures; 3.) collecting data; 4.) organizing and cleaning data; 5.) analyzing data; 6.) writing and disseminating reports to stakeholders. The back drop of these objectives includes building an organizational culture that is comfortable with the use of data and evidence to guide programmatic decision-making. The following accomplishments were completed in calendar year 2022:

- The initial development of a localized, hybrid data management system using Microsoft Access that tracks all delinquency cases referred to the office, and provides space to track Diversion Unit case throughputs.
- The development of a recidivism study, beginning with a 2017 cohort, showcasing the proportion of youth in Greene County that recidivate one year after case closure, which was a rate of 25% or 1 in every 4 youth.
- The initial development of 10 continuous quality improvement teams through the Greene County Juvenile Office with the purpose of reviewing data reports and using Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) cycles to conduct quality improvement.
- The development of the Abuse and Neglect Annual Report which reports input, output, and outcome data. The report has been recognized by leading consultants in the field nationally.
- The creation of five data dashboard reports that provide information for the following units (i.e., Delinquency Intake, Abuse / Neglect, Family Treatment Court, Law/Status Involvement, Detention).
- The completion of 24 ad hoc data projects (i.e., administration of surveys, time studies, caseload analysis, trend analysis, etc.).

## Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal With Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>255</b>
Clark	0	33	11	2	0	0	0	16	21	56	0	1	34	174
Schuyler	0	9	10	0	1	0	0	2	9	5	0	0	4	40
Scotland	0	7	1	1	0	0	0	1	12	16	0	0	3	41
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>349</b>
Adair	0	75	8	0	0	3	0	8	22	20	22	40	16	214
Knox	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	6	3	22
Lewis	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	4	14	40	7	10	30	113
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>446</b>
Grundy	0	23	30	0	0	0	0	5	43	37	5	40	62	245
Harrison	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	1	21	5	3	32	10	94
Mercer	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	9	8	23
Putnam	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	13	7	10	1	29	17	84
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>524</b>
Atchison	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	8	18	1	0	4	9	50
Gentry	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	17	9	0	1	0	4	42
Holt	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	14	19	2	0	1	12	56
Nodaway	0	50	13	1	0	0	0	155	57	2	1	9	62	350
Worth	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	9	26
<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>1,403</b>
Andrew	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	5	16	15	0	3	6	59
Buchanan	2	112	32	0	3	4	0	112	587	159	4	247	82	1,344
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>467</b>
Platte	0	30	3	0	0	5	0	30	161	146	21	1	70	467
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>704</b>
Clay	0	127	11	1	0	18	2	111	154	13	39	9	219	704
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>205</b>
Carroll	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	23	9	17	0	0	1	54
Ray	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	63	16	34	13	3	2	151
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>247</b>
Chariton	0	9	5	0	1	0	0	3	4	14	2	6	10	54
Linn	0	25	5	0	0	0	0	19	10	23	6	12	30	130
Sullivan	0	9	7	0	0	0	0	8	6	22	0	2	9	63
<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>428</b>
Marion	1	1	14	51	0	0	0	107	99	7	6	26	44	356
Monroe	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	8
Ralls	0	3	7	2	0	0	0	21	13	2	0	3	13	64
<b>11</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>1,148</b>
St. Charles	24	109	61	0	0	20	3	69	268	68	179	7	340	1,148
<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>723</b>
Audrain	0	42	16	9	3	3	1	35	48	103	10	13	13	296
Montgomery	0	27	8	0	0	0	0	20	52	68	1	26	8	210
Warren	0	40	1	0	0	0	0	17	13	86	8	36	16	217



## Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal With Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>2,067</b>
Boone	0	159	325	3	0	1	0	359	69	480	68	26	28	1,518
Callaway	0	65	62	0	2	6	0	32	47	252	36	15	32	549
<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>774</b>
Howard	0	22	10	0	0	1	0	10	2	48	14	15	4	126
Randolph	0	101	6	0	0	3	0	56	96	220	37	78	51	648
<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>568</b>
Lafayette	0	25	24	0	0	6	2	8	40	111	18	17	38	289
Saline	0	38	0	0	0	0	1	29	36	104	13	7	51	279
<b>16</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>2,198</b>
Jackson	242	587	162	1	58	149	18	53	10	47	57	187	627	2,198
<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>1,707</b>
Cass	3	107	182	0	0	4	3	312	170	422	43	1	39	1,286
Johnson	0	38	46	0	0	0	1	82	94	105	19	2	34	421
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>658</b>
Cooper	0	10	15	3	0	0	0	22	42	100	10	23	39	264
Pettis	0	31	57	1	0	0	0	49	64	104	13	25	50	394
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>710</b>
Cole	0	60	48	6	0	146	0	23	59	223	80	21	44	710
<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>761</b>
Franklin	5	114	26	0	1	5	0	73	83	172	53	21	79	632
Gasconade	0	22	0	0	0	3	0	9	5	32	3	0	17	91
Osage	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	6	2	10	38
<b>21</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>1,024</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2,199</b>	<b>5,354</b>
St. Louis Co.	124	383	96	99	185	32	11	285	238	1,024	651	27	2,199	5,354
<b>22</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>1,503</b>
St. Louis City	43	377	107	1	4	55	24	3	94	120	128	16	531	1,503
<b>23</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>756</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>2,070</b>
Jefferson	34	330	112	0	0	110	0	27	163	756	50	396	92	2,070
<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>598</b>
Madison	0	17	0	0	0	2	0	13	4	3	0	2	3	44
St. Francois	3	95	20	0	2	7	0	79	11	156	12	17	26	428
St. Genevieve	5	16	3	0	0	2	0	23	9	23	6	0	14	101
Washington	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	1	25
<b>25</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>937</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>2,371</b>
Maries	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	1	0	3	9	41
Phelps	1	132	22	1	1	4	1	182	55	16	5	196	231	847
Pulaski	2	77	18	0	0	8	0	410	29	0	1	215	46	806
Texas	0	40	6	0	0	1	0	342	50	4	26	188	20	677

## Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal With Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>1,120</b>
Camden	0	35	10	4	0	0	0	47	21	92	18	29	15	271
Laclede	0	24	15	2	0	0	0	65	101	121	3	25	49	405
Miller	0	32	7	7	0	0	0	13	20	104	9	26	24	242
Moniteau	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	1	5	41	0	0	10	64
Morgan	0	7	9	2	0	0	0	1	20	71	6	0	22	138
<b>27</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>520</b>
Bates	1	7	5	1	0	1	0	66	35	26	6	8	7	163
Benton	0	22	8	0	0	0	0	14	16	8	3	3	1	75
Henry	4	23	7	0	0	2	0	61	60	5	4	9	2	177
St. Clair	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	27	33	24	4	1	3	105
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>968</b>
Barton	0	28	13	0	0	0	0	69	17	5	0	4	6	142
Cedar	0	36	2	0	0	0	0	129	7	24	0	9	15	222
Dade	0	5	0	0	4	0	0	45	3	8	1	2	2	70
Vernon	0	48	15	2	2	0	0	161	40	201	5	19	41	534
<b>29</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>339</b>
Jasper	4	192	46	2	0	15	0	27	13	26	2	3	9	339
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>901</b>
Dallas	0	24	12	0	0	1	0	5	13	37	5	24	17	138
Hickory	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	27	11	19	22	87
Polk	0	37	10	0	0	0	0	19	22	108	57	70	61	384
Webster	0	43	9	0	0	0	1	6	12	84	10	91	36	292
<b>31</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>813</b>
Greene	2	356	56	1	3	47	6	10	109	75	74	15	59	813
<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1,250</b>
Bollinger	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	46	17	2	12	11	103
Cape Girardeau	1	57	58	2	0	1	0	123	259	197	13	70	47	828
Perry	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	3	241	14	16	1	24	319
<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>708</b>
Mississippi	0	53	10	0	0	0	0	46	38	9	0	7	21	184
Scott	0	62	6	8	2	0	1	78	177	32	21	18	119	524
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>648</b>
New Madrid	0	38	13	0	0	0	0	71	68	5	8	29	26	258
Pemiscot	0	56	26	4	0	0	0	113	83	6	0	60	42	390
<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1,101</b>
Dunklin	0	71	25	1	1	23	1	2	1	253	0	0	4	382
Stoddard	1	131	9	0	0	29	0	184	220	0	18	127	0	719
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>540</b>
Butler	0	140	47	1	0	1	0	55	40	121	7	16	39	467
Ripley	0	30	9	0	0	0	0	8	2	18	0	2	4	73

Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal With Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>37</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>458</b>
Carter	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	2	22	44
Howell	9	46	20	0	0	3	1	95	45	15	3	41	47	325
Oregon	0	15	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0	6	13	50
Shannon	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	2	2	7	4	39
<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>1,227</b>
Christian	0	122	27	8	9	2	2	405	215	12	12	239	174	1,227
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>1,108</b>
Barry	0	46	12	0	4	0	0	190	18	72	1	5	30	378
Lawrence	0	56	7	3	8	0	0	159	12	46	8	33	71	403
Stone	0	79	14	0	1	5	0	52	21	113	20	8	14	327
<b>40</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>929</b>
McDonald	3	81	24	0	0	11	0	85	78	10	2	31	22	347
Newton	0	85	10	0	1	49	0	10	74	99	17	117	120	582
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>266</b>
Macon	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	50	42	11	2	4	26	153
Shelby	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	25	61	3	0	0	11	113
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>336</b>
Crawford	0	63	9	0	0	0	0	10	14	9	16	12	36	169
Dent	0	42	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	13	2	8	1	86
Iron	0	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	40
Reynolds	0	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	28
Wayne	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>696</b>
Caldwell	0	25	7	1	0	0	0	4	11	11	2	9	7	77
Clinton	0	12	5	1	0	0	0	12	13	53	7	13	18	134
Daviess	0	9	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	10	8	14	7	67
DeKalb	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	1	10	4	34
Livingston	0	49	4	3	0	1	0	12	28	83	8	65	131	384
<b>44</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>152</b>
Douglas	0	23	7	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	5	0	44
Ozark	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	24
Wright	1	12	9	2	0	2	0	4	39	2	0	7	6	84
<b>45</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>648</b>
Lincoln	11	53	11	0	0	16	4	50	36	149	16	12	154	512
Pike	5	14	3	0	3	3	0	18	4	38	7	9	32	136
<b>46</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>526</b>
Taney	27	174	4	0	0	8	2	27	70	70	35	33	76	526
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>6,370</b>	<b>2,308</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>818</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>6,076</b>	<b>5,795</b>	<b>8,089</b>	<b>2,150</b>	<b>3,465</b>	<b>7,225</b>	<b>43,492</b>

## Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>33</b>
Clark	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	0	0	7	23
Schuyler	0	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10
Scotland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>136</b>
Adair	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	5	19	15	16	15	9	88
Knox	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	2	9
Lewis	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	6	0	10	39
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>128</b>
Grundy	0	3	24	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4	7	13	66
Harrison	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	15	2	3	7	6	46
Mercer	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	6
Putnam	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	4	0	10
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>94</b>
Atchison	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	7
Gentry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	10
Holt	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	10
Nodaway	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	19	23	0	1	4	10	63
Worth	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>273</b>
Andrew	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	3	20
Buchanan	2	24	14	0	1	3	0	57	35	45	4	42	26	253
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>355</b>
Platte	0	4	3	0	0	2	0	22	131	118	16	0	59	355
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>359</b>
Clay	0	29	10	0	0	3	2	109	148	13	37	7	1	359
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>98</b>
Carroll	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	14	4	4	0	0	0	26
Ray	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	23	9	8	10	3	1	72
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>21</b>
Chariton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Linn	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	4	2	5	15
Sullivan	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5
<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>208</b>
Marion	0	1	10	20	0	0	0	56	46	4	6	12	21	176
Monroe	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ralls	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	10	5	0	0	2	7	31
<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>799</b>
St. Charles	7	23	51	0	0	9	3	51	224	22	139	7	263	799
<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>167</b>
Audrain	0	5	10	4	1	0	1	6	19	31	4	4	9	94
Montgomery	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	1	4	1	35
Warren	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4	8	8	38

## Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>824</b>
Boone	0	7	174	1	0	1	0	209	33	134	40	16	15	630
Callaway	0	4	40	0	2	1	0	7	17	83	22	5	13	194
<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>118</b>
Howard	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6	0	10	2	0	2	26
Randolph	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	36	17	11	1	16	92
<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>290</b>
Lafayette	0	10	18	0	0	2	1	3	26	60	9	4	28	161
Saline	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	22	39	12	2	33	129
<b>16</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>918</b>
Jackson	53	55	97	1	36	55	16	53	10	47	33	118	344	918
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>639</b>
Cass	0	3	135	0	0	2	3	119	81	99	21	1	12	476
Johnson	0	2	16	0	0	0	1	30	49	32	14	0	19	163
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>388</b>
Cooper	0	0	14	3	0	0	0	10	25	40	10	11	29	142
Pettis	0	1	51	1	0	0	0	23	43	61	8	11	47	246
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>385</b>
Cole	0	7	18	2	0	111	0	20	36	121	44	10	16	385
<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>367</b>
Franklin	4	12	22	0	1	3	0	40	44	79	47	10	53	315
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	14	2	0	9	35
Osage	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	1	6	17
<b>21</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1,279</b>	<b>3,048</b>
St. Louis Co.	41	33	56	54	57	13	11	251	177	571	498	7	1,279	3,048
<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>904</b>
St. Louis City	18	40	86	1	2	23	23	1	47	62	122	11	468	904
<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>799</b>
Jefferson	11	13	59	0	0	39	0	9	84	498	39	4	43	799
<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>317</b>
Madison	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	0	2	2	11
St. Francois	3	17	20	0	1	4	0	63	10	80	10	8	21	237
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	19	6	11	5	0	14	60
Washington	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	9
<b>25</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>295</b>
Maries	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	11
Phelps	1	5	4	0	0	1	1	14	15	2	0	37	33	113
Pulaski	0	5	7	0	0	3	0	30	5	0	0	22	3	75
Texas	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	50	22	1	10	6	3	96

## Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>337</b>
Camden	0	7	4	4	0	0	0	32	10	25	13	5	5	105
Laclede	0	2	9	2	0	0	0	11	52	4	2	0	11	93
Miller	0	7	5	5	0	0	0	10	14	25	6	0	12	84
Moniteau	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	5	19
Morgan	0	2	6	1	0	0	0	1	9	7	2	0	8	36
<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>127</b>
Bates	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	1	2	1	2	30
Benton	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	3	1	0	0	24
Henry	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	26	4	2	1	2	42
St. Clair	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	4	14	3	3	0	2	31
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>328</b>
Barton	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	30	10	1	0	0	0	54
Cedar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	4	8	0	2	9	80
Dade	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	2	1	0	2	23
Vernon	0	11	11	1	1	0	0	37	20	67	3	5	15	171
<b>29</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>127</b>
Jasper	4	21	26	2	0	10	0	25	13	19	1	2	4	127
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>421</b>
Dallas	0	3	8	0	0	1	0	2	13	19	2	7	6	61
Hickory	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	10	3	16	48
Polk	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	10	20	43	22	15	54	178
Webster	0	7	8	0	0	0	1	4	12	52	8	8	34	134
<b>31</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>341</b>
Greene	2	24	43	1	2	5	6	10	100	63	71	8	6	341
<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>383</b>
Bollinger	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	2	2	3	20
Cape Girardeau	1	4	21	2	0	0	0	17	99	72	9	21	34	280
Perry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	2	14	0	14	83
<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>381</b>
Mississippi	0	13	6	0	0	0	0	12	24	5	0	6	13	79
Scott	0	18	6	5	2	0	1	34	95	27	16	12	86	302
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>186</b>
New Madrid	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	16	20	3	6	2	9	70
Pemiscot	0	11	22	2	0	0	0	28	20	1	0	8	24	116
<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>234</b>
Dunklin	0	5	20	1	0	10	1	2	0	22	0	0	3	64
Stoddard	1	7	5	0	0	13	0	68	60	0	9	7	0	170
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>233</b>
Butler	0	9	25	0	0	1	0	43	9	65	7	9	37	205
Ripley	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	0	2	4	28

## Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>37</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>161</b>
Carter	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	16	29
Howell	8	2	15	0	0	2	1	24	24	1	3	10	12	102
Oregon	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	8	15
Shannon	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	2	0	2	15
<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>371</b>
Christian	0	16	8	0	4	2	2	115	101	3	6	75	39	371
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>470</b>
Barry	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	52	16	32	0	0	21	135
Lawrence	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	100	7	22	3	15	36	195
Stone	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	42	16	40	14	4	9	140
<b>40</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>409</b>
McDonald	2	9	15	0	0	0	0	26	54	3	2	11	18	140
Newton	0	7	9	0	0	4	0	3	51	48	9	47	91	269
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>50</b>
Macon	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	3	1	2	12	35
Shelby	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	3	15
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>96</b>
Crawford	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	6	8	7	16	0	24	72
Dent	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	2	0	17
Iron	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Reynolds	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
Wayne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>207</b>
Caldwell	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	1	0	6	27
Clinton	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	8	3	15	5	1	11	51
Daviess	0	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	8	5	3	32
DeKalb	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	5	1	12
Livingston	0	7	3	1	0	0	0	8	11	31	6	2	16	85
<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>78</b>
Douglas	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	3	0	16
Ozark	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
Wright	0	4	9	2	0	1	0	1	30	1	0	5	1	54
<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>201</b>
Lincoln	7	4	6	0	0	3	4	30	13	44	7	6	32	156
Pike	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	11	3	12	4	0	8	45
<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>163</b>
Taney	0	10	4	0	0	0	2	14	29	30	26	6	42	163
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>1,453</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>2,328</b>	<b>2,710</b>	<b>3,255</b>	<b>1,546</b>	<b>743</b>	<b>3,817</b>	<b>17,267</b>

## Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>149</b>
Clark	0	3	7	1	0	0	11	15	50	0	1	6	94
Schuyler	0	1	4	0	0	0	2	9	2	0	0	2	20
Scotland	0	4	1	1	0	0	1	12	15	0	0	1	35
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>108</b>
Adair	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	6	15	1	33
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3	1	8
Lewis	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	26	1	8	20	67
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>144</b>
Grundy	0	0	6	0	0	0	2	18	29	1	8	28	92
Harrison	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	6	1	14
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	5	8
Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	10	0	3	4	30
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>239</b>
Atchison	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	15	0	0	4	6	35
Gentry	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	8
Holt	0	4	1	0	0	0	13	13	0	0	0	4	35
Nodaway	0	0	7	0	0	0	87	30	2	0	1	24	151
Worth	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	10
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>582</b>
Andrew	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	0	0	0	22
Buchanan	0	15	6	0	1	1	55	216	112	0	140	14	560
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>82</b>
Platte	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	30	28	5	1	9	82
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>
Clay	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	2	2	0	20
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>92</b>
Carroll	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	13	0	0	1	27
Ray	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	7	14	3	0	1	65
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>144</b>
Chariton	0	1	4	0	1	0	3	4	4	2	5	8	32
Linn	0	1	1	0	0	0	16	7	20	2	10	22	79
Sullivan	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	6	13	0	2	3	33
<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>172</b>
Marion	0	0	0	7	0	0	50	53	3	0	12	20	145
Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Ralls	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	0	0	1	5	24
<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>210</b>
St. Charles	1	0	5	0	0	0	18	39	46	33	0	68	210
<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>399</b>
Audrain	0	4	2	2	2	0	26	29	70	6	6	3	150
Montgomery	0	1	0	0	0	0	19	44	59	0	3	5	131
Warren	0	2	0	0	0	0	11	10	70	1	17	7	118



## Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>983</b>
Boone	0	22	126	0	0	0	144	36	339	28	8	12	715
Callaway	0	5	15	0	0	0	13	30	164	13	10	18	268
<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>354</b>
Howard	0	7	5	0	0	0	2	2	27	4	9	1	57
Randolph	0	32	5	0	0	0	38	47	95	15	46	19	297
<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>214</b>
Lafayette	0	5	6	0	0	0	5	14	45	9	12	7	103
Saline	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	14	65	1	5	12	111
<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>46</b>
Jackson	1	3	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	7	2	28	46
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>672</b>
Cass	0	4	21	0	0	0	168	88	198	22	0	10	511
Johnson	0	5	15	0	0	0	51	45	28	5	2	10	161
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>192</b>
Cooper	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	17	53	0	9	6	95
Pettis	0	2	5	0	0	0	26	9	40	5	9	1	97
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>229</b>
Cole	0	8	7	4	0	30	3	23	100	36	7	11	229
<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>264</b>
Franklin	1	4	4	0	0	0	33	39	93	5	11	26	216
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	18	1	0	8	32
Osage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	1	4	16
<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>1,242</b>
St. Louis Co.	1	1	0	4	8	3	34	54	415	120	19	583	1,242
<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>127</b>
St. Louis City	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	42	31	1	0	48	127
<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>495</b>
Jefferson	11	8	43	0	0	40	18	79	256	10	6	24	495
<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>144</b>
Madison	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	3	0	0	1	15
St. Francois	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	1	76	2	4	5	104
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	1	0	0	20
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>1,090</b>
Maries	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Phelps	0	5	3	0	0	0	88	40	5	2	55	100	298
Pulaski	0	1	11	0	0	0	257	23	0	1	70	26	389
Texas	0	3	4	0	0	1	268	28	3	15	62	15	399

## Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>334</b>
Camden	0	3	0	0	0	0	13	8	29	5	15	2	75
Laclede	0	8	1	0	0	0	54	49	12	1	20	19	164
Miller	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	1	2	2	31
Moniteau	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	0	0	5	21
Morgan	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	17	3	0	12	43
<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>130</b>
Bates	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	13	12	3	1	3	45
Benton	0	2	2	0	0	0	7	5	4	0	1	1	22
Henry	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	17	0	2	3	0	37
St. Clair	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	6	1	0	1	26
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>359</b>
Barton	0	3	2	0	0	0	24	7	1	0	0	0	37
Cedar	0	1	0	0	0	0	43	3	6	0	5	3	61
Dade	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	2	0	2	0	28
Vernon	0	7	4	1	0	0	58	20	118	2	12	11	233
<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>28</b>
Jasper	0	12	2	0	0	1	2	0	7	1	1	2	28
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>157</b>
Dallas	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	2	2	5	16
Hickory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	3	1	14
Polk	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	35	33	24	2	101
Webster	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	0	11	2	26
<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>24</b>
Greene	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	9	9	2	0	1	24
<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>491</b>
Bollinger	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15	0	1	6	55
Cape Girardeau	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	63	124	4	18	11	277
Perry	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	136	11	2	1	6	159
<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>197</b>
Mississippi	0	1	4	0	0	0	31	13	3	0	1	7	60
Scott	0	1	0	2	0	0	35	52	5	5	6	31	137
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>305</b>
New Madrid	0	0	2	0	0	0	50	48	2	1	6	12	121
Pemiscot	0	1	2	2	0	0	85	63	5	0	13	13	184
<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>238</b>
Dunklin	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	84	0	0	1	90
Stoddard	0	1	2	0	0	1	47	86	0	2	9	0	148
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>66</b>
Butler	0	1	2	0	0	0	7	0	41	0	7	2	60
Ripley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6

## Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>37</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>173</b>
Carter	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	1	6	12
Howell	1	0	2	0	0	0	71	21	14	0	6	21	136
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	1	3	13
Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	2	2	12
<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>615</b>
Christian	0	29	12	4	5	0	286	101	6	5	99	68	615
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>232</b>
Barry	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	2	31	0	0	6	68
Lawrence	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5	22	4	15	26	98
Stone	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	42	6	1	4	66
<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>273</b>
McDonald	0	6	2	0	0	0	50	14	5	0	19	4	100
Newton	0	5	0	0	0	0	7	23	49	7	54	28	173
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>147</b>
Macon	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	18	7	1	1	11	75
Shelby	0	0	2	0	0	0	17	45	1	0	0	7	72
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>85</b>
Crawford	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	0	7	12	33
Dent	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	6	2	2	1	29
Iron	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	10
Reynolds	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	11
Wayne	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>197</b>
Caldwell	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	6	5	1	2	1	19
Clinton	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	10	37	2	1	1	57
Daviess	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	0	3	2	20
DeKalb	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	8
Livingston	0	1	1	1	0	0	4	17	52	1	0	16	93
<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>
Douglas	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	4
Ozark	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Wright	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	0	2	2	16
<b>45</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>221</b>
Lincoln	1	2	5	0	0	0	18	23	102	8	3	18	180
Pike	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	20	3	1	11	41
<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>135</b>
Taney	0	7	0	0	0	0	13	17	37	9	22	30	135
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>2,817</b>	<b>2,265</b>	<b>3,741</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>1,004</b>	<b>1,688</b>	<b>12,823</b>

## Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>73</b>
Clark	0	29	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	21	57
Schuyler	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	10
Scotland	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	6
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>105</b>
Adair	0	74	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	10	6	93
Knox	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	5
Lewis	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	7
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>174</b>
Grundy	0	20	0	0	0	0	3	16	2	0	25	21	87
Harrison	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	19	3	34
Mercer	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	9
Putnam	0	4	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	22	13	44
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>190</b>
Atchison	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	8
Gentry	0	11	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	24
Holt	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	6	11
Nodaway	0	50	0	1	0	0	49	4	0	0	3	28	135
Worth	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	12
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>195</b>
Andrew	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	11
Buchanan	0	65	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	42	184
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>27</b>
Platte	0	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	27
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>323</b>
Clay	0	88	1	1	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	218	323
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>
Carroll	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Ray	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	13
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>82</b>
Chariton	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	1	1	21
Linn	0	23	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	3	36
Sullivan	0	7	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	0	2	25
<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>48</b>
Marion	1	0	4	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	35
Monroe	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Ralls	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	9
<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>131</b>
St. Charles	16	84	0	0		11	0	5	0	6	0	9	131
<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>157</b>
Audrain	0	33	4	3	0	3	3	0	2	0	3	1	52
Montgomery	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	19	2	44
Warren	0	35	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3	11	1	61

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>260</b>
Boone	0	130	25	2	0	0	6	0	7	0	2	1	173
Callaway	0	56	7	0	0	5	12	0	5	1	0	1	87
<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>302</b>
Howard	0	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	11	8	6	1	43
Randolph	0	68	1	0	0	3	8	13	108	11	31	16	259
<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>64</b>
Lafayette	1	10	0	0	0	4	0	0	6	0	1	3	25
Saline	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	39
<b>16</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>1,046</b>
Jackson	173	475	38	0	18	71	0	0	0	0	64	207	1,046
<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>385</b>
Cass	3	100	23	0	0	2	25	1	125	0	0	17	296
Johnson	0	30	9	0	0	0	1	0	44	0	0	5	89
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>77</b>
Cooper	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	7	0	3	4	27
Pettis	0	28	1	0	0	0	0	12	3	0	4	2	50
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>96</b>
Cole	0	45	23	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	4	17	96
<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>130</b>
Franklin	0	98	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	101
Gasconade	0	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Osage	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
<b>21</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>966</b>
St. Louis Co.	77	346	30	28	71	11	0	7	37	32	1	326	966
<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>422</b>
St. Louis City	22	320	3	0	2	26	0	5	26	3	0	15	422
<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>750</b>
Jefferson	8	302	3	0	0	24	0	0	1	1	386	25	750
<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>137</b>
Madison	0	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
St. Francois	0	78	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	87
Ste. Genevieve	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Washington	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>982</b>
Maries	3	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	9	26
Phelps	0	122	15	1	1	3	80	0	9	3	104	98	436
Pulaski	1	69	0	0	0	4	123	1	0	0	123	17	338
Texas	0	35	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	1	120	2	182

## Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>418</b>
Camden	0	23	0	0	0	0	2	1	38	0	9	8	81
Laclede	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	0	5	19	142
Miller	0	22	1	2	0	0	2	2	56	2	24	10	121
Moniteau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	21
Morgan	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	1	0	2	53
<b>27</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>263</b>
Bates	0	7	4	0	0	1	50	4	13	1	6	2	88
Benton	0	18	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	29
Henry	4	23	2	0	0	2	44	17	1	0	5	0	98
St. Clair	3	1	2	0	0	0	17	9	15	0	1	0	48
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>280</b>
Barton	0	22	1	0	0	0	15	0	3	0	4	6	51
Cedar	0	35	2	0	0	0	29	0	10	0	2	3	81
Dade	0	3	0	0	4	0	8	0	4	0	0	0	19
Vernon	0	30	0	0	1	0	66	0	16		1	15	129
<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>184</b>
Jasper		159	18	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	184
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>306</b>
Dallas	0	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	15	4	49
Hickory	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	13	5	25
Polk		30	0	0	0	0	6	1	28	2	31	3	101
Webster	0	36	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	2	72	0	131
<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>448</b>
Greene		331	12	0	1	41	0	0	3	1	7	52	448
<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>376</b>
Bollinger	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	9	2	28
Cape Girardeau	0	53	37	0	0	1	49	97	1	0	31	2	271
Perry	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	52	1	0	0	4	77
<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>110</b>
Mississippi	0	39	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	45
Scott	0	42	0	1	0	0	1	19	0	0	0	2	65
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>156</b>
New Madrid	0	35	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	21	5	67
Pemiscot	0	44	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5	89
<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>628</b>
Dunklin	0	66	1	0	1	12	0	1	147	0	0	0	228
Stoddard	0	123	1	0	0	15	69	74	0	7	111	0	400
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>241</b>
Butler	0	130	20	1	0	0	5	31	15	0	0	0	202
Ripley	0	30	2	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	39

Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>120</b>
Carter	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Howell	0	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	25	13	83
Oregon	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	22
Shannon	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	12
<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>241</b>
Christian	0	77	7	4	0	0	4	13	3	1	65	67	241
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>402</b>
Barry	0	41	0	0	4	0	109	0	9	1	5	2	171
Lawrence	0	51	0	3	8	0	33	0	2	1	3	9	110
Stone	0	77	0	0	1	5	3	0	31	0	3	1	121
<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>230</b>
McDonald	0	66	5	0	0	11	7	0	0	0	1	0	90
Newton	0	73	1	0	1	45	0	0	2	1	16	1	140
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>68</b>
Macon	0	16	1	0	0	0	4	16	1	0	1	3	42
Shelby	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	9	2	0	0	1	26
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>155</b>
Crawford	0	57	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	64
Dent	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	40
Iron	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Reynolds	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Wayne	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>290</b>
Caldwell	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	31
Clinton	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	6	26
Daviess	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	15
DeKalb	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	14
Livingston	0	41	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	61	99	204
<b>44</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>51</b>
Douglas	0	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	24
Ozark	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Wright	1	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	14
<b>45</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>223</b>
Lincoln	2	46	0	0	0	13	2	0	2	1	3	104	173
Pike	2	13	0	0	3	3	2	0	6	0	8	13	50
<b>46</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>228</b>
Taney	27	157	0	0	0	8	0	24	3	0	5	4	228
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>5,378</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>1,067</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1,705</b>	<b>1,655</b>	<b>12,554</b>





Appendix E: Administrative Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Stoddard	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
Howell	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
Barry	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
<b>40</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>
McDonald	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	2	0	0	0	17
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Macon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
Livingston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
<b>45</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
Lincoln	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>848</b>

## Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>255</b>
Clark	0	13	2	7	1	94	57	174
Schuyler	1	3	4	2	0	20	10	40
Scotland	0	0	0	0	0	35	6	41
<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>349</b>
Adair	3	31	39	2	13	33	93	214
Knox	0	2	3	2	2	8	5	22
Lewis	3	15	6	11	4	67	7	113
<b>3</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>446</b>
Grundy	9	25	24	0	8	92	87	245
Harrison	8	14	11	3	10	14	34	94
Mercer	2	2	1	1	0	8	9	23
Putnam	5	1	0	0	4	30	44	84
<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>524</b>
Atchison	1	0	4	0	2	35	8	50
Gentry	1	5	3	1	0	8	24	42
Holt	5	1	1	2	1	35	11	56
Nodaway	13	11	16	6	18	151	135	350
Worth	0	0	1	1	2	10	12	26
<b>5</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>1,403</b>
Andrew	11	8	4	0	3	22	11	59
Buchanan	414	111	63	6	6	560	184	1,344
<b>6</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>467</b>
Platte	117	89	41	55	56	82	27	467
<b>7</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>704</b>
Clay	28	144	71	32	78	28	323	704
<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>205</b>
Carroll	0	7	14	0	5	27	1	54
Ray	3	27	23	0	20	65	13	151
<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>247</b>
Chariton	0	0	1	0	0	32	21	54
Linn	1	7	4	0	3	79	36	130
Sullivan	1	0	4	0	0	33	25	63
<b>10</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>428</b>
Marion	44	32	27	40	33	145	35	356
Monroe	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	8
Ralls	6	8	8	4	5	24	9	64
<b>11</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>1,148</b>
St. Charles	64	292	256	55	135	215	131	1,148
<b>12</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>723</b>
Audrain	12	33	34	4	11	150	52	296
Montgomery	7	12	13	0	3	131	44	210
Warren	0	12	17	3	6	118	61	217

## Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>983</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>2,067</b>
Boone	64	224	187	74	81	715	173	1,518
Callaway	24	99	38	8	25	268	87	549
<b>14</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>774</b>
Howard	3	9	4	6	4	57	43	126
Randolph	24	23	23	8	14	297	259	648
<b>15</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>568</b>
Lafayette	27	66	30	13	25	103	25	289
Saline	38	57	24	8	2	111	39	279
<b>16</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>1,046</b>	<b>2,198</b>
Jackson	291	442	237	76	60	46	1,046	2,198
<b>17</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>672</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>1,707</b>
Cass	44	197	123	34	81	511	296	1,286
Johnson	33	69	29	8	32	161	89	421
<b>18</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>658</b>
Cooper	16	64	27	21	14	95	27	264
Pettis	25	93	76	17	36	97	50	394
<b>19</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>710</b>
Cole	53	131	115	35	51	229	96	710
<b>20</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>761</b>
Franklin	25	119	65	23	83	216	101	632
Gasconade	1	11	9	2	12	32	24	91
Osage	2	8	3	2	2	16	5	38
<b>21</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>997</b>	<b>1,265</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>1,246</b>	<b>966</b>	<b>5,354</b>
St. Louis Co.	516	997	1,265	93	271	1,246	966	5,354
<b>22</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>1,503</b>
St. Louis City	162	197	541	21	33	127	422	1,503
<b>23</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>2,070</b>
Jefferson	111	358	129	40	187	495	750	2,070
<b>24</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>598</b>
Madison	3	3	3	2	0	15	18	44
St. Francois	14	114	40	33	36	104	87	428
Ste. Genevieve	10	22	9	10	9	20	21	101
Washington	0	2	6	1	0	5	11	25
<b>25</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>1,090</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>2,371</b>
Maries	0	1	5	0	5	4	26	41
Phelps	10	51	18	2	32	298	436	847
Pulaski	19	25	20	1	14	389	338	806
Texas	16	24	27	4	25	399	182	677
<b>26</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>1,120</b>
Camden	18	45	22	7	23	75	81	271
Laclede	13	35	17	18	16	164	142	405
Miller	27	41	11	5	6	31	121	242
Moniteau	7	9	2	3	1	21	21	64
Morgan	12	17	7	3	3	43	53	138

## Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>520</b>
Bates	6	10	11	0	2	46	88	163
Benton	1	7	6	2	8	22	29	75
Henry	8	10	4	8	12	37	98	177
St. Clair	1	13	12	1	4	26	48	105
<b>28</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>968</b>
Barton	13	8	11	5	17	37	51	142
Cedar	10	27	19	5	19	61	81	222
Dade	3	7	10	0	3	28	19	70
Vernon	16	80	35	15	26	233	129	534
<b>29</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>339</b>
Jasper	7	62	37	7	14	28	184	339
<b>30</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>901</b>
Dallas	19	25	9	6	14	16	49	138
Hickory	1	18	9	9	11	14	25	87
Polk	18	97	38	16	13	101	101	384
Webster	19	52	35	16	13	26	131	292
<b>31</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>813</b>
Greene	23	195	81	7	35	24	448	813
<b>32</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>1,250</b>
Bollinger	10	6	1	0	3	55	28	103
Cape Girardeau	56	129	57	11	27	277	271	828
Perry	40	16	10	3	14	159	77	319
<b>33</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>708</b>
Mississippi	17	21	20	16	5	60	45	184
Scott	55	126	78	33	30	137	65	524
<b>34</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>648</b>
New Madrid	4	14	19	17	16	121	67	258
Pemiscot	16	40	20	23	18	184	89	390
<b>35</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>1,101</b>
Dunklin	6	25	18	13	2	90	228	382
Stoddard	11	46	24	58	32	148	400	719
<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>540</b>
Butler	16	77	49	20	43	60	202	467
Ripley	0	17	8	0	3	6	39	73
<b>37</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>458</b>
Carter	4	14	5	3	3	12	3	44
Howell	17	37	35	1	16	136	83	325
Oregon	1	8	3	1	2	13	22	50
Shannon	4	1	6	1	3	12	12	39

## Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
<b>38</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>1,227</b>
Christian	41	143	54	24	109	615	241	1,227
<b>39</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>1,108</b>
Barry	60	32	28	4	15	68	171	378
Lawrence	61	61	30	4	39	98	110	403
Stone	15	53	27	4	41	66	121	327
<b>40</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>929</b>
McDonald	37	37	33	17	33	100	90	347
Newton	36	73	51	37	72	173	140	582
<b>41</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>266</b>
Macon	19	5	7	0	5	75	42	153
Shelby	10	4	1	0	0	72	26	113
<b>42</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>336</b>
Crawford	12	28	11	1	20	33	64	169
Dent	6	3	4	0	4	29	40	86
Iron	0	1	0	0	0	10	29	40
Reynolds	1	1	0	0	3	11	12	28
Wayne	0	0	1	0	0	2	10	13
<b>43</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>696</b>
Caldwell	4	11	5	0	7	19	31	77
Clinton	9	25	12	3	2	57	26	134
Daviess	10	9	3	1	9	20	15	67
DeKalb	5	4	0	1	2	8	14	34
Livingston	20	29	11	9	18	93	204	384
<b>44</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>152</b>
Douglas	1	8	4	0	3	4	24	44
Ozark	1	2	3	2	0	3	13	24
Wright	12	22	7	6	7	16	14	84
<b>45</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>648</b>
Lincoln	11	82	27	23	16	180	173	512
Pike	11	16	8	2	8	41	50	136
<b>46</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>526</b>
Taney	14	59	40	10	40	135	228	526
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>3,165</b>	<b>6,354</b>	<b>4,845</b>	<b>1,260</b>	<b>2,473</b>	<b>12,841</b>	<b>12,554</b>	<b>43,492</b>

## Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>
Clark	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	2	1	0	0	23
Schuyler	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	10
Scotland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>136</b>
Adair	2	3	0	15	5	0	0	0	15	22	10	16	0	0	88
Knox	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	9
Lewis	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	12	7	7	4	0	0	39
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>128</b>
Grundy	0	1	0	7	10	1	2	0	13	17	8	7	0	0	66
Harrison	0	0	0	9	3	1	6	0	9	5	2	11	0	0	46
Mercer	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Putnam	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	10
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>94</b>
Atchison	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	7
Gentry	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	10
Holt	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	1	1	1	0	0	10
Nodaway	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	17	10	6	24	0	0	63
Worth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	4
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>273</b>
Andrew	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	7	5	0	1	0	0	20
Buchanan	4	4	0	24	12	0	3	0	96	19	27	15	0	49	253
<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>355</b>
Platte	2	3	1	10	19	3	95	0	45	65	49	63	0	0	355
<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>359</b>
Clay	5	6	1	40	42	4	4	8	72	58	46	69	4	0	359
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>98</b>
Carroll	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	4	0	0	26
Ray	0	0	0	5	7	1	3	0	30	6	1	19	0	0	72
<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>
Chariton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Linn	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3	3	1	2	0	0	15
Sullivan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	5
<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>208</b>
Marion	5	8	0	27	6	0	17	0	44	34	2	24	0	9	176
Monroe	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ralls	2	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	11	6	1	5	0	0	31
<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>799</b>
St. Charles	3	22	6	134	92	11	9	5	244	124	11	138	0	0	799
<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>167</b>
Audrain	0	4	0	16	11	1	5	0	27	6	8	13	0	3	94
Montgomery	1	0	0	4	4	0	1	0	8	6	1	6	0	4	35
Warren	0	1	0	6	3	4	2	0	2	9	2	9	0	0	38
<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>824</b>
Boone	10	24	4	65	75	4	4	0	268	93	18	65	0	0	630
Callaway	1	5	0	17	18	6	0	0	85	23	13	26	0	0	194

## Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>118</b>
Howard	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	7	2	7	2	0	3	26
Randolph	0	1	1	12	9	2	3	0	19	19	5	5	0	16	92
<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>290</b>
Lafayette	0	5	1	15	3	5	5	0	74	26	4	17	1	5	161
Saline	3	1	0	9	3	6	0	0	67	4	0	2	1	33	129
<b>16</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>918</b>
Jackson	91	45	11	158	100	53	4	0	339	57	22	35	0	3	918
<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>639</b>
Cass	11	7	0	54	52	2	22	0	177	54	11	86	0	0	476
Johnson	6	4	1	12	27	3	12	0	48	16	6	28	0	0	163
<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>388</b>
Cooper	6	0	0	5	19	0	1	0	71	19	0	19	0	2	142
Pettis	7	8	1	30	28	3	4	0	80	42	16	27	0	0	246
<b>19</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>385</b>
Cole	5	10	1	50	47	1	0	0	164	58	5	40	4	0	385
<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>367</b>
Franklin	1	5	3	28	36	4	3	0	80	39	18	95	1	2	315
Gasconade	1	1	0	4	7	0	0	0	6	6	0	10	0	0	35
Osage	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	7	1	1	2	0	0	17
<b>21</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1,237</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>3,048</b>
St. Louis Co.	76	111	20	723	203	54	45	4	1,237	274	100	150	4	47	3,048
<b>22</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>904</b>
St. Louis City	40	33	2	281	104	10	3	0	325	40	5	35	1	25	904
<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>799</b>
Jefferson	1	7	5	87	71	14	9	0	363	69	10	160	0	3	799
<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>317</b>
Madison	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	11
St. Francois	7	5	0	29	36	2	3	0	53	17	53	30	0	2	237
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	4	6	1	0	0	0	24	5	9	7	0	4	60
Washington	2	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>295</b>
Maries	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	11
Phelps	2	1	4	10	10	2	0	0	48	9	7	20	0	0	113
Pulaski	3	0	0	10	9	0	2	0	35	3	3	9	1	0	75
Texas	1	1	1	11	11	0	7	0	26	9	1	25	0	3	96
<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>337</b>
Camden	0	4	2	9	7	0	2	0	37	9	4	30	0	1	105
Laclede	0	3	1	5	1	0	0	0	20	24	23	15	0	1	93
Miller	1	3	1	15	9	6	1	0	11	3	17	4	7	6	84
Moniteau	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	7	4	0	1	0	0	19
Morgan	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	14	9	0	4	0	2	36

## Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>127</b>
Bates	0	0	0	4	6	0	1	1	8	4	0	5	0	1	30
Benton	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	7	4	2	5	0	0	24
Henry	0	1	0	3	5	0	0	0	12	4	1	11	0	5	42
St. Clair	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	7	5	3	9	0	1	31
<b>28</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>328</b>
Barton	1	3	0	6	2	0	7	0	16	6	0	13	0	0	54
Cedar	1	2	0	6	8	1	3	0	17	15	0	21	0	6	80
Dade	4	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	5	5	0	2	0	2	23
Vernon	3	1	0	16	12	0	8	0	77	22	3	29	0	0	171
<b>29</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>127</b>
Jasper	1	4	0	31	21	0	4	0	44	11	3	8	0	0	127
<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>421</b>
Dallas	0	1	0	8	13	0	1	0	19	3	4	12	0	0	61
Hickory	0	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	27	3	0	8	0	0	48
Polk	1	1	0	15	19	0	2	0	91	17	13	16	0	3	178
Webster	2	0	0	26	17	1	12	0	42	9	8	15	0	2	134
<b>31</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>341</b>
Greene	13	5	1	50	62	4	0	0	131	22	6	47	0	0	341
<b>32</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>383</b>
Bollinger	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	6	0	3	3	0	3	20
Cape Girardeau	4	10	2	30	52	9	1	0	78	31	10	28	0	25	280
Perry	0	3	0	2	5	2	11	0	22	3	3	12	0	20	83
<b>33</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>381</b>
Mississippi	1	3	1	9	8	2	3	0	22	19	3	8	0	0	79
Scott	7	8	4	23	26	5	6	0	110	60	10	36	0	7	302
<b>34</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>186</b>
New Madrid	0	2	0	2	6	1	3	0	24	17	1	14	0	0	70
Pemiscot	1	7	2	11	10	2	0	0	54	15	1	10	3	0	116
<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>234</b>
Dunklin	0	2	0	14	9	0	0	0	18	13	2	4	1	1	64
Stoddard	1	2	1	8	9	0	0	0	46	36	29	38	0	0	170
<b>36</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>233</b>
Butler	2	4	0	37	27	0	3	0	62	27	0	43	0	0	205
Ripley	2	1	0	6	5	0	2	0	8	1	0	3	0	0	28
<b>37</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>161</b>
Carter	0	2	0	3	2	0	1	0	9	3	6	3	0	0	29
Howell	9	6	1	19	20	0	3	0	13	12	12	4	0	3	102
Oregon	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	15
Shannon	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	4	1	0	3	0	0	15
<b>38</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>371</b>
Christian	8	7	3	49	42	4	14	0	128	29	19	67	1	0	371
<b>39</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>470</b>
Barry	0	1	0	12	5	2	1	0	26	20	0	15	53	0	135
Lawrence	2	2	1	18	6	1	5	0	50	16	0	42	52	0	195
Stone	0	3	7	24	11	2	0	0	42	11	0	35	5	0	140



Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>409</b>
McDonald	0	6	2	19	33	1	3	0	40	17	1	18	0	0	140
Newton	0	4	0	31	21	0	18	0	86	46	3	60	0	0	269
<b>41</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>50</b>
Macon	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	7	2	0	6	0	13	35
Shelby	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	15
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>96</b>
Crawford	0	1	0	9	7	6	2	0	20	7	1	19	0	0	72
Dent	0	0	2	5	3	0	2	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	17
Iron	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Reynolds	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	5
Wayne	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>207</b>
Caldwell	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	13	3	1	7	0	0	27
Clinton	0	0	1	6	4	2	8	0	7	12	9	2	0	0	51
Daviess	0	0	0	4	9	0	2	0	5	1	2	9	0	0	32
DeKalb	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	12
Livingston	0	1	0	9	5	0	9	0	26	8	10	17	0	0	85
<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>78</b>
Douglas	0	1	0	4	3	0	0	0	3	1	1	3	0	0	16
Ozark	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	8
Wright	0	2	0	8	7	0	4	0	16	5	4	8	0	0	54
<b>45</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>201</b>
Lincoln	1	0	0	20	19	3	1	0	61	33	1	17	0	0	156
Pike	1	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	16	1	4	7	0	8	45
<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>163</b>
Taney	0	1	0	10	14	0	10	0	66	12	10	40	0	0	163
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>2,556</b>	<b>1,703</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>1,970</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>2,190</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>17,267</b>

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>73</b>
Clark	14	0	43	57
Schuyler	0	0	10	10
Scotland	0	0	6	6
<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>105</b>
Adair	6	0	87	93
Knox	2	0	3	5
Lewis	0	0	7	7
<b>3</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>174</b>
Grundy	1	0	86	87
Harrison	3	0	31	34
Mercer	2	0	7	9
Putnam	16	0	28	44
<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>190</b>
Atchison	2	0	6	8
Gentry	0	0	24	24
Holt	3	0	8	11
Nodaway	9	0	126	135
Worth	0	1	11	12
<b>5</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>195</b>
Andrew	5	0	6	11
Buchanan	82	0	102	184
<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>27</b>
Platte	5	0	22	27
<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>323</b>
Clay	10	13	300	323
<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>
Carroll	0	0	1	1
Ray	11	0	2	13
<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>82</b>
Chariton	0	10	11	21
Linn	2	1	33	36
Sullivan	0	3	22	25
<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>48</b>
Marion	0	2	33	35
Monroe	0	0	4	4
Ralls	2	4	3	9
<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>131</b>
St. Charles	17	17	97	131
<b>12</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>157</b>
Audrain	13	0	39	52
Montgomery	16	0	28	44
Warren	4	2	55	61
<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>260</b>
Boone	1	20	152	173
Callaway	0	2	85	87

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
<b>14</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>302</b>
Howard	20	0	23	43
Randolph	96	0	163	259
<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>64</b>
Lafayette	5	1	19	25
Saline	0	39	0	39
<b>16</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>1,046</b>
Jackson	183	246	617	1,046
<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>385</b>
Cass	1	28	267	296
Johnson	0	40	49	89
<b>18</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>77</b>
Cooper	2	3	22	27
Pettis	1	6	43	50
<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>96</b>
Cole	21	0	75	96
<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>
Franklin	0	0	101	101
Gasconade	0	0	24	24
Osage	0	0	5	5
<b>21</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>966</b>
St. Louis Co.	243	157	566	966
<b>22</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>422</b>
St. Louis City	29	72	321	422
<b>23</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>750</b>
Jefferson	397	140	213	750
<b>24</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>137</b>
Madison	1	0	17	18
St. Francois	14	0	73	87
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	21	21
Washington	7	0	4	11
<b>25</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>714</b>	<b>982</b>
Maries	2	3	21	26
Phelps	69	8	359	436
Pulaski	119	3	216	338
Texas	63	1	118	182
<b>26</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>418</b>
Camden	10	39	32	81
Laclede	15	106	21	142
Miller	33	59	29	121
Moniteau	2	19	0	21
Morgan	4	42	7	53
<b>27</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>263</b>
Bates	16	0	72	88
Benton	4	2	23	29
Henry	7	2	89	98
St. Clair	11	0	37	48

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
<b>28</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>280</b>
Barton	0	4	47	51
Cedar	6	1	74	81
Dade	5	0	14	19
Vernon	2	10	117	129
<b>29</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>184</b>
Jasper	11	1	172	184
<b>30</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>306</b>
Dallas	3	12	34	49
Hickory	8	6	11	25
Polk	13	36	52	101
Webster	35	13	83	131
<b>31</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>448</b>
Greene	103	50	295	448
<b>32</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>376</b>
Bollinger	10	0	18	28
Cape Girardeau	36	5	230	271
Perry	6	0	71	77
<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>110</b>
Mississippi	0	0	45	45
Scott	0	0	65	65
<b>34</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>156</b>
New Madrid	16	1	50	67
Pemiscot	24	3	62	89
<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>511</b>	<b>628</b>
Dunklin	4	0	224	228
Stoddard	21	92	287	400
<b>36</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>241</b>
Butler	11	0	191	202
Ripley	4	0	35	39
<b>37</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>120</b>
Carter	2	1	0	3
Howell	4	48	31	83
Oregon	2	13	7	22
Shannon	1	7	4	12
<b>38</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>241</b>
Christian	98	14	129	241
<b>39</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>402</b>
Barry	3	44	124	171
Lawrence	2	60	48	110
Stone	10	82	29	121
<b>40</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>230</b>
McDonald	4	0	86	90
Newton	20	0	120	140

Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
<b>41</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>68</b>
Macon	6	2	34	42
Shelby	1	2	23	26
<b>42</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>155</b>
Crawford	11	0	53	64
Dent	0	0	40	40
Iron	0	0	29	29
Reynolds	2	0	10	12
Wayne	4	0	6	10
<b>43</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>290</b>
Caldwell	5	0	26	31
Clinton	11	0	15	26
Daviess	2	0	13	15
DeKalb	4	1	9	14
Livingston	74	0	130	204
<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>51</b>
Douglas	0	8	16	24
Ozark	0	2	11	13
Wright	0	2	12	14
<b>45</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>223</b>
Lincoln	85	18	70	173
Pike	3	12	35	50
<b>46</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>228</b>
Taney	5	82	141	228
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>2,278</b>	<b>1,723</b>	<b>8,553</b>	<b>12,554</b>

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>149</b>
Clark	50	11	0	0	0	4	29	94
Schuyler	16	1	0	0	0	0	3	20
Scotland	27	4	0	0	0	0	4	35
<b>2</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>108</b>
Adair	11	3	16	0	0	0	3	33
Knox	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	8
Lewis	32	9	1	0	0	4	21	67
<b>3</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>144</b>
Grundy	41	1	1	0	0	0	49	92
Harrison	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	14
Mercer	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	8
Putnam	8	8	0	0	0	3	11	30
<b>4</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>239</b>
Atchison	15	11	0	0	0	0	9	35
Gentry	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	8
Holt	12	15	0	0	0	0	8	35
Nodaway	38	68	4	0	0	5	36	151
Worth	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	10
<b>5</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>582</b>
Andrew	13	0	2	1	0	0	6	22
Buchanan	189	64	76	1	2	3	225	560
<b>6</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>82</b>
Platte	35	8	8	0	0	0	31	82
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>
Clay	0	5	7	3	0	0	5	20
<b>8</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>92</b>
Carroll	12	2	2	1	0	0	10	27
Ray	45	2	6	3	0	0	9	65
<b>9</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>144</b>
Chariton	25	2	0	0	0	0	5	32
Linn	67	2	0	0	0	0	10	79
Sullivan	21	0	0	0	0	0	12	33
<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>172</b>
Marion	10	59	2	0	0	48	26	145
Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Ralls	3	14	0	0	0	4	3	24
<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>210</b>
St. Charles	21	3	137	12	0	0	37	210
<b>12</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>399</b>
Audrain	78	15	28	0	1	18	10	150
Montgomery	49	14	8	0	0	50	10	131
Warren	58	6	19	0	0	25	10	118

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>983</b>
Boone	513	151	0	0	0	1	50	715
Callaway	82	128	1	2	0	1	54	268
<b>14</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>354</b>
Howard	35	10	2	0	0	0	10	57
Randolph	149	28	27	2	2	0	89	297
<b>15</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>214</b>
Lafayette	28	32	14	6	10	0	13	103
Saline	8	54	14	0	21	0	14	111
<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>46</b>
Jackson	12	10	11	0	0	5	8	46
<b>17</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>672</b>
Cass	210	79	83	0	0	85	54	511
Johnson	69	37	27	0	0	0	28	161
<b>18</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>192</b>
Cooper	55	16	15	0	0	1	8	95
Pettis	33	20	38	0	0	0	6	97
<b>19</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>229</b>
Cole	84	98	23	9	1	0	14	229
<b>20</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>264</b>
Franklin	91	9	5	1	0	2	108	216
Gasconade	18	2	1	7	0	0	4	32
Osage	10	0	2	0	0	0	4	16
<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>1,242</b>
St. Louis Co.	18	6	787	172	7	35	217	1,242
<b>22</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>127</b>
St. Louis City	19	0	36	9	0	0	63	127
<b>23</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>495</b>
Jefferson	112	57	137	14	0	0	175	495
<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>144</b>
Madison	7	3	0	0	0	0	5	15
St. Francois	9	8	1	0	0	63	23	104
Ste. Genevieve	9	6	3	0	0	0	2	20
Washington	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
<b>25</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>1,090</b>
Maries	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Phelps	185	42	10	0	0	0	61	298
Pulaski	256	3	36	0	0	0	94	389
Texas	199	0	20	0	0	0	180	399
<b>26</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>334</b>
Camden	50	4	2	0	0	2	17	75
Laclede	46	6	0	0	0	41	71	164
Miller	9	8	4	0	0	1	9	31
Moniteau	5	1	5	0	0	1	9	21
Morgan	10	1	10	0	3	4	15	43

Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
<b>27</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>130</b>
Bates	11	11	8	0	0	2	13	45
Benton	12	2	5	0	0	0	3	22
Henry	23	6	5	0	0	1	2	37
St. Clair	16	2	5	0	0	1	2	26
<b>28</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>359</b>
Barton	6	7	3	0	0	1	20	37
Cedar	12	13	15	0	0	3	18	61
Dade	17	0	0	0	0	0	11	28
Vernon	53	71	30	0	0	0	79	233
<b>29</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>
Jasper	13	7	8	0	0	0	0	28
<b>30</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>157</b>
Dallas	1	5	6	0	0	0	4	16
Hickory	6	2	4	0	0	0	2	14
Polk	14	20	61	0	0	1	5	101
Webster	20	1	3	0	0	0	2	26
<b>31</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>
Greene	15	5	4	0	0	0	0	24
<b>32</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>491</b>
Bollinger	21	0	0	0	0	0	34	55
Cape Girardeau	105	2	57	4	0	0	109	277
Perry	75	2	16	0	0	0	66	159
<b>33</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>197</b>
Mississippi	19	5	6	1	0	0	29	60
Scott	49	22	15	23	0	0	28	137
<b>34</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>305</b>
New Madrid	62	23	16	0	0	0	20	121
Pemiscot	80	35	21	0	0	1	47	184
<b>35</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>238</b>
Dunklin	0	14	0	0	0	5	71	90
Stoddard	45	6	1	0	0	57	39	148
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66</b>
Butler	0	3	57	0	0	0	0	60
Ripley	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6
<b>37</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>173</b>
Carter	5	2	3	0	0	2	0	12
Howell	15	16	27	0	1	7	70	136
Oregon	10	1	1	0	0	0	1	13
Shannon	3	1	1	0	1	2	4	12
<b>38</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>615</b>
Christian	547	18	6	0	0	26	18	615



Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
<b>39</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>232</b>
Barry	49	8	11	0	0	0	0	68
Lawrence	49	17	32	0	0	0	0	98
Stone	38	3	25	0	0	0	0	66
<b>40</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>273</b>
McDonald	31	31	9	0	0	2	27	100
Newton	49	47	57	3	0	2	15	173
<b>41</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>147</b>
Macon	37	13	5	0	0	0	20	75
Shelby	31	10	0	0	0	1	30	72
<b>42</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>85</b>
Crawford	6	6	7	0	0	10	4	33
Dent	6	9	0	0	0	8	6	29
Iron	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	10
Reynolds	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	11
Wayne	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
<b>43</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>197</b>
Caldwell	6	3	3	0	0	0	7	19
Clinton	17	3	9	0	0	0	28	57
Daviess	5	4	3	0	0	0	8	20
DeKalb	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	8
Livingston	33	10	12	0	0	0	38	93
<b>44</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23</b>
Douglas	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	4
Ozark	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
Wright	5	4	1	0	0	0	6	16
<b>45</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>221</b>
Lincoln	26	3	28	4	0	0	119	180
Pike	14	1	5	0	0	0	21	41
<b>46</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>135</b>
Taney	63	33	32	0	0	1	6	135
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>4,975</b>	<b>1,680</b>	<b>2,261</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>3,039</b>	<b>12,823</b>

## Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Formal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Juvenile Informal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Probation/ Parole Violation	Probation Violation	Violation Of Valid Court Order	Total
<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Nodaway	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>5</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>353</b>
Andrew	6	0	0	0	0	6
Buchanan	292	20	0	0	35	347
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
Platte	0	0	0	0	3	3
<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
Clay	1	1	0	0	0	2
<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Ray	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>
St. Charles	7	0	0	0	1	8
<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>188</b>
Jackson	1	166	0	0	21	188
<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>
Cass	2	0	0	0	1	3
Johnson	7	1	0	0	0	8
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Pettis	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>
St. Louis Co.	0	0	0	0	98	98
<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>50</b>
St. Louis City	23	26	0	0	1	50
<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>
Jefferson	0	0	0	0	26	26
<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
Pulaski	1	0	3	0	0	4
<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>
Camden	0	0	10	0	0	10
Laclede	0	0	4	2	0	6
Miller	0	0	5	1	0	6
Moniteau	1	0	0	2	0	3
Morgan	0	0	0	6	0	6
<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Vernon	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>30</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>
Dallas	11	0	0	0	1	12
Polk	1	1	0	0	2	4
Webster	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>33</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>
Scott	20	0	0	0	0	20
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Pemiscot	0	1	0	0	0	1

## Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Formal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Juvenile Informal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Probation/ Parole Violation	Probation Violation	Violation Of Valid Court Order	Total
<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Stoddard	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>37</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
Howell	2	2	0	0	0	4
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Barry	0	0	1	0	3	4
<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>
McDonald	0	0	17	0	0	17
<b>41</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Macon	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
Livingston	0	0	0	0	2	2
<b>45</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
Lincoln	3	0	0	0	0	3
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>848</b>

Appendix K: Out of Home Placements by Circuit

Circuit	Court Residential Care Cases	Court Residential Care %	DMH Cases	DMH %	CD Cases	CD %	DYS* Cases	DYS* %	Relative Cases	Relative %	Private Agency Cases	Private Agency %	Public Agency Cases	Public Agency %	Other Cases	Other %	Total Cases
1	0	0%	0	0%	46	94%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	6%	49
2	0	0%	0	0%	81	99%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	82
3	0	0%	0	0%	34	85%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	40
4	0	0%	0	0%	58	78%	5	7%	8	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3	4%	74
5	22	18%	5	4%	67	55%	19	16%	3	2%	4	3%	1	1%	0	0%	121
6	0	0%	0	0%	22	73%	4	13%	1	3%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	30
7	0	0%	0	0%	88	69%	28	22%	2	2%	0	0%	9	7%	0	0%	127
8	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6
9	0	0%	0	0%	37	86%	0	0%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	43
10	0	0%	0	0%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	5
11	0	0%	0	0%	76	70%	26	24%	6	6%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	109
12	3	3%	0	0%	69	63%	11	10%	20	18%	0	0%	0	0%	6	6%	109
13	4	2%	0	0%	211	94%	5	2%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	224
14	0	0%	1	1%	87	71%	1	1%	32	26%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	123
15	1	2%	0	0%	43	68%	15	24%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	63
16	40	7%	0	0%	481	82%	26	4%	29	5%	2	0%	2	0%	7	1%	587
17	1	1%	0	0%	83	57%	3	2%	52	36%	1	1%	1	1%	4	3%	145
18	1	2%	1	2%	37	90%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	41
19	0	0%	0	0%	54	90%	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	60
20	0	0%	0	0%	124	89%	16	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	140
21	0	0%	0	0%	258	67%	15	4%	96	25%	0	0%	1	0%	13	3%	383
22	1	0%	0	0%	306	81%	47	12%	19	5%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	377
23	2	1%	0	0%	126	38%	28	8%	171	52%	0	0%	1	0%	2	1%	330
24	0	0%	0	0%	115	83%	6	4%	6	4%	8	6%	0	0%	4	3%	139
25	6	2%	0	0%	185	72%	13	5%	52	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	257
26	0	0%	0	0%	72	71%	9	9%	2	2%	0	0%	10	10%	8	8%	101
27	1	2%	2	4%	40	70%	3	5%	10	18%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	57
28	0	0%	0	0%	98	84%	17	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	117
29	5	3%	0	0%	139	72%	18	9%	12	6%	16	8%	0	0%	2	1%	192
30	0	0%	0	0%	81	76%	12	11%	7	7%	1	1%	1	1%	4	4%	106
31	1	0%	0	0%	266	75%	16	4%	63	18%	0	0%	10	3%	0	0%	356
32	0	0%	0	0%	63	95%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	66
33	0	0%	0	0%	69	60%	23	20%	9	8%	0	0%	0	0%	14	12%	115
34	0	0%	0	0%	79	84%	0	0%	2	2%	1	1%	12	13%	0	0%	94
35	4	2%	0	0%	178	88%	3	1%	14	7%	0	0%	2	1%	1	0%	202
36	0	0%	0	0%	142	81%	10	6%	19	11%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	175
37	0	0%	0	0%	66	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	66
38	0	0%	0	0%	95	78%	22	18%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	122
39	1	1%	1	1%	169	93%	4	2%	3	2%	0	0%	2	1%	1	1%	181
40	3	2%	3	2%	101	61%	15	9%	44	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	166
41	0	0%	0	0%	24	96%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	25
42	1	1%	0	0%	153	89%	2	1%	9	5%	0	0%	3	2%	3	2%	171
43	2	2%	0	0%	85	83%	4	4%	4	4%	5	5%	2	2%	0	0%	102
44	0	0%	0	0%	44	92%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	48
45	0	0%	0	0%	59	88%	7	10%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	67
46	0	0%	0	0%	164	94%	10	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	174
<b>Total</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4,879</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>6,367</b>

\*Might not match DYS Commitment Counts

Department of Mental Health (DMH), Children's Division (CD), and Division of Youth Services (DYS)

Appendix L: In Home Services by Circuit

Circuit	Supervision By Court Cases	Supervision By Court %	DMH Cases	DMH %	CD Cases	CD %	DYS Cases	DYS %	Private Agency Cases	Private Agency %	Public Agency Cases	Public Agency %	Other Cases	Other %	Total Cases
1	60	57%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%	6	6%	13	12%	24	23%	106
2	52	63%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	29	35%	0	0%	0	0%	82
3	72	72%	2	2%	24	24%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	100
4	114	70%	17	10%	5	3%	0	0%	9	6%	9	6%	8	5%	162
5	615	98%	0	0%	12	2%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0	0%	630
6	142	84%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	27	16%	170
7	164	99%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	165
8	31	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	31
9	11	58%	0	0%	8	42%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	19
10	1	11%	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	5	56%	9
11	306	50%	12	2%	1	0%	1	0%	235	38%	63	10%	0	0%	618
12	75	66%	16	14%	9	8%	2	2%	5	4%	1	1%	5	4%	113
13	320	99%	0	0%	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	323
14	21	72%	0	0%	3	10%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	4	14%	29
15	44	98%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	45
16	94	72%	0	0%	30	23%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%	131
17	488	98%	0	0%	9	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	498
18	40	73%	1	2%	2	4%	0	0%	9	16%	0	0%	3	5%	55
19	57	54%	0	0%	43	41%	0	0%	6	6%	0	0%	0	0%	106
20	72	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	72
21	86	88%	0	0%	10	10%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	98
22	142	99%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	143
23	272	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	272
24	27	59%	19	41%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	46
25	29	66%	0	0%	14	32%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	44
26	87	98%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	89
27	154	76%	12	6%	29	14%	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%	2	1%	202
28	77	93%	0	0%	3	4%	0	0%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	83
29	28	70%	0	0%	12	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	40
30	59	87%	0	0%	4	6%	0	0%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	68
31	128	91%	0	0%	13	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	141
32	101	81%	0	0%	23	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	124
33	119	72%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	43	26%	4	2%	166
34	35	52%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	27	40%	67
35	245	99%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	248
36	42	42%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	57	57%	100
37	65	98%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	66
38	102	89%	0	0%	10	9%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	114
39	14	67%	3	14%	3	14%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	21
40	128	97%	1	1%	3	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	132
41	16	64%	3	12%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	25
42	5	71%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	7
43	14	93%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	15
44	17	94%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	18
45	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16
46	72	97%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	74
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,859</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5,883</b>

Department of Mental Health (DMH), Children's Division (CD), and Division of Youth Services (DYS)



## Appendix N: Certification to Adult Court by Circuit, Race, and Gender

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>White Male</b>	<b>White Female</b>	<b>Black Male</b>	<b>Black Female</b>	<b>Hispanic Male</b>	<b>Hispanic Female</b>	<b>Other Male</b>	<b>Other Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
11	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
12	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
13	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	8
15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
16	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	5
18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
20	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
21	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
22	0	0	15	0	1	0	0	0	16
24	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
28	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
31	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
33	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
34	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
35	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	7
36	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
37	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
38	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
39	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
45	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
46	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>77</b>

Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>1</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>
Clark	17	17	100%
Schuyler	11	11	100%
Scotland	0	0	NA
<b>2</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>88%</b>
Adair	96	88	92%
Knox	10	6	60%
Lewis	41	36	88%
<b>3</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>86%</b>
Grundy	69	55	80%
Harrison	49	46	94%
Mercer	7	6	86%
Putnam	7	6	86%
<b>4</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>92%</b>
Atchison	3	3	100%
Gentry	5	5	100%
Holt	2	2	100%
Nodaway	59	53	90%
Worth	2	2	100%
<b>5</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>63%</b>
Andrew	18	6	33%
Buchanan	278	179	64%
<b>6</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>82%</b>
Platte	276	225	82%
<b>7</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>60%</b>
Clay	396	239	60%
<b>8</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>75%</b>
Carroll	29	18	62%
Ray	73	58	79%
<b>9</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>87%</b>
Chariton	1	1	100%
Linn	13	11	85%
Sullivan	1	1	100%
<b>10</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>80%</b>
Marion	175	145	83%
Monroe	13	3	23%
Ralls	34	29	85%
<b>11</b>	<b>906</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>53%</b>
St. Charles	906	479	53%



Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>66%</b>
Audrain	99	63	64%
Montgomery	36	25	69%
Warren	32	23	72%
<b>13</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>71%</b>
Boone	625	475	76%
Callaway	219	123	56%
<b>14</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>50%</b>
Howard	32	13	41%
Randolph	103	55	53%
<b>15</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>60%</b>
Lafayette	181	111	61%
Saline	117	68	58%
<b>16</b>	<b>1,125</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>53%</b>
Jackson	1,125	594	53%
<b>17</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>79%</b>
Cass	468	354	76%
Johnson	168	149	89%
<b>18</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>81%</b>
Cooper	166	152	92%
Pettis	225	166	74%
<b>19</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>68%</b>
Cole	356	241	68%
<b>20</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>53%</b>
Franklin	355	190	54%
Gasconade	31	19	61%
Osage	17	6	35%
<b>21</b>	<b>3,310</b>	<b>2,056</b>	<b>62%</b>
St. Louis Co.	3,310	2,056	62%
<b>22</b>	<b>1,005</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>83%</b>
St. Louis City	1,005	833	83%
<b>23</b>	<b>915</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>50%</b>
Jefferson	915	462	50%
<b>24</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>55%</b>
Madison	10	8	80%
St. Francois	276	173	63%
St. Genevieve	51	36	71%
Washington	65	6	9%

Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>76%</b>
Maries	3	2	67%
Phelps	127	99	78%
Pulaski	96	79	82%
Texas	87	59	68%
<b>26</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>60%</b>
Camden	117	95	81%
Laclede	126	33	26%
Miller	93	74	80%
Moniteau	23	18	78%
Morgan	51	26	51%
<b>27</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>62%</b>
Bates	25	20	80%
Benton	25	16	64%
Henry	58	29	50%
St. Clair	28	19	68%
<b>28</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>61%</b>
Barton	62	26	42%
Cedar	78	66	85%
Dade	27	18	67%
Vernon	167	95	57%
<b>29</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>79%</b>
Jasper	138	109	79%
<b>30</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>100%</b>
Dallas	63	63	100%
Hickory	47	47	100%
Polk	179	179	100%
Webster	129	129	100%
<b>31</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>64%</b>
Greene	346	222	64%
<b>32</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>70%</b>
Bollinger	16	12	75%
Cape Girardeau	288	192	67%
Perry	58	51	88%
<b>33</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>91%</b>
Mississippi	66	62	94%
Scott	294	267	91%
<b>34</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>98%</b>
New Madrid	67	66	99%
Pemiscot	123	121	98%
<b>35</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>86%</b>
Dunklin	86	50	58%
Stoddard	166	166	100%

Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>36</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>72%</b>
Butler	227	168	74%
Ripley	29	17	59%
<b>37</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>80%</b>
Carter	31	30	97%
Howell	114	88	77%
Oregon	18	13	72%
Shannon	15	12	80%
<b>38</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>56%</b>
Christian	409	228	56%
<b>39</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>69%</b>
Barry	92	61	66%
Lawrence	146	109	75%
Stone	130	84	65%
<b>40</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>75%</b>
McDonald	142	116	82%
Newton	284	203	71%
<b>41</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>88%</b>
Macon	36	32	89%
Shelby	20	17	85%
<b>42</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>79%</b>
Crawford	59	48	81%
Dent	10	10	100%
Iron	1	1	100%
Reynolds	8	6	75%
Wayne	6	1	17%
<b>43</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>89%</b>
Caldwell	29	20	69%
Clinton	57	54	95%
Daviess	32	29	91%
DeKalb	10	9	90%
Livingston	91	82	90%
<b>44</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>95%</b>
Douglas	17	16	94%
Ozark	7	7	100%
Wright	51	48	94%
<b>45</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>49%</b>
Lincoln	174	94	54%
Pike	59	21	36%
<b>46</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>78%</b>
Taney	157	122	78%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>18,298</b>	<b>12,387</b>	<b>68%</b>

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>1</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>99%</b>
Clark	88	87	99%
Schuyler	17	17	100%
Scotland	31	31	100%
<b>2</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>92%</b>
Adair	35	34	97%
Knox	15	14	93%
Lewis	67	60	90%
<b>3</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>89%</b>
Grundy	97	84	87%
Harrison	12	12	100%
Mercer	8	8	100%
Putnam	31	28	90%
<b>4</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>96%</b>
Atchison	13	13	100%
Gentry	5	5	100%
Holt	6	6	100%
Nodaway	117	112	96%
Worth	1	1	100%
<b>5</b>	<b>911</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>91%</b>
Andrew	20	15	75%
Buchanan	891	813	91%
<b>6</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>90%</b>
Platte	164	148	90%
<b>7</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>59%</b>
Clay	46	27	59%
<b>8</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>79%</b>
Carroll	27	22	81%
Ray	65	51	78%
<b>9</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>79%</b>
Chariton	27	24	89%
Linn	59	45	76%
Sullivan	29	22	76%
<b>10</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>83%</b>
Marion	148	131	89%
Monroe	10	0	0%
Ralls	26	22	85%
<b>11</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>82%</b>
St. Charles	190	156	82%
<b>12</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>72%</b>
Audrain	153	116	76%
Montgomery	121	95	79%
Warren	131	82	63%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>13</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>66%</b>
Boone	667	498	75%
Callaway	260	118	45%
<b>14</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>58%</b>
Howard	64	33	52%
Randolph	276	164	59%
<b>15</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>60%</b>
Lafayette	77	55	71%
Saline	156	84	54%
<b>16</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>68%</b>
Jackson	87	59	68%
<b>17</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>585</b>	<b>86%</b>
Cass	496	419	84%
Johnson	184	166	90%
<b>18</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>90%</b>
Cooper	94	91	97%
Pettis	100	83	83%
<b>19</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>78%</b>
Cole	223	175	78%
<b>20</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>69%</b>
Franklin	200	131	66%
Gasconade	30	29	97%
Osage	16	9	56%
<b>21</b>	<b>1,193</b>	<b>917</b>	<b>77%</b>
St. Louis Co.	1,193	917	77%
<b>22</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>56%</b>
St. Louis City	161	90	56%
<b>23</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>56%</b>
Jefferson	541	302	56%
<b>24</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>70%</b>
Madison	14	13	93%
St. Francois	114	71	62%
St. Genevieve	24	22	92%
Washington	0	0	NA
<b>25</b>	<b>1,081</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>90%</b>
Maries	3	3	100%
Phelps	315	280	89%
Pulaski	385	346	90%
Texas	378	342	90%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>26</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>72%</b>
Camden	72	57	79%
Laclede	151	103	68%
Miller	38	22	58%
Moniteau	21	18	86%
Morgan	44	34	77%
<b>27</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>70%</b>
Bates	53	45	85%
Benton	26	18	69%
Henry	56	31	55%
St. Clair	29	20	69%
<b>28</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>75%</b>
Barton	36	22	61%
Cedar	60	58	97%
Dade	28	28	100%
Vernon	239	166	69%
<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>83%</b>
Jasper	30	25	83%
<b>30</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>99%</b>
Dallas	26	26	100%
Hickory	15	15	100%
Polk	102	102	100%
Webster	27	26	96%
<b>31</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>80%</b>
Greene	20	16	80%
<b>32</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>84%</b>
Bollinger	64	55	86%
Cape Girardeau	275	207	75%
Perry	153	149	97%
<b>33</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>91%</b>
Mississippi	48	42	88%
Scott	151	140	93%
<b>34</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>98%</b>
New Madrid	134	134	100%
Pemiscot	214	208	97%
<b>35</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>76%</b>
Dunklin	266	166	62%
Stoddard	152	150	99%
<b>36</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>81%</b>
Butler	62	51	82%
Ripley	8	6	75%

Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>37</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>94%</b>
Carter	10	10	100%
Howell	122	113	93%
Oregon	11	11	100%
Shannon	8	8	100%
<b>38</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>65%</b>
Christian	474	308	65%
<b>39</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>86%</b>
Barry	124	110	89%
Lawrence	146	125	86%
Stone	68	56	82%
<b>40</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>86%</b>
McDonald	109	98	90%
Newton	183	154	84%
<b>41</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>92%</b>
Macon	75	68	91%
Shelby	62	58	94%
<b>42</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>95%</b>
Crawford	25	22	88%
Dent	39	38	97%
Iron	29	28	97%
Reynolds	2	2	100%
Wayne	2	2	100%
<b>43</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>94%</b>
Caldwell	14	11	79%
Clinton	59	59	100%
Daviess	20	20	100%
DeKalb	13	10	77%
Livingston	95	88	93%
<b>44</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>94%</b>
Douglas	2	2	100%
Ozark	4	3	75%
Wright	12	12	100%
<b>45</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>83%</b>
Lincoln	188	162	86%
Pike	44	31	70%
<b>46</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>79%</b>
Taney	140	110	79%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>13,388</b>	<b>10,640</b>	<b>79%</b>

Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>1</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100%</b>
Clark	57	57	100%
Schuyler	7	7	100%
Scotland	5	5	100%
<b>2</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>98%</b>
Adair	93	93	100%
Knox	6	5	83%
Lewis	7	6	86%
<b>3</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>98%</b>
Grundy	87	86	99%
Harrison	36	35	97%
Mercer	9	9	100%
Putnam	44	43	98%
<b>4</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>97%</b>
Atchison	7	7	100%
Gentry	24	24	100%
Holt	9	9	100%
Nodaway	69	66	96%
Worth	6	6	100%
<b>5</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>98%</b>
Andrew	11	11	100%
Buchanan	185	182	98%
<b>6</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>96%</b>
Platte	26	25	96%
<b>7</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>68%</b>
Clay	336	229	68%
<b>8</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>20%</b>
Carroll	0	0	NA
Ray	15	3	20%
<b>9</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>80%</b>
Chariton	21	10	48%
Linn	28	25	89%
Sullivan	26	25	96%
<b>10</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>60%</b>
Marion	60	37	62%
Monroe	14	5	36%
Ralls	6	6	100%
<b>11</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>98%</b>
St. Charles	112	110	98%
<b>12</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>91%</b>
Audrain	52	46	88%
Montgomery	41	39	95%
Warren	61	55	90%
<b>13</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>86%</b>
Boone	180	154	86%
Callaway	99	87	88%



Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>14</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>55%</b>
Howard	35	24	69%
Randolph	199	105	53%
<b>15</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>94%</b>
Lafayette	22	21	95%
Saline	41	38	93%
<b>16</b>	<b>1,024</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>85%</b>
Jackson	1,024	870	85%
<b>17</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>89%</b>
Cass	278	245	88%
Johnson	85	78	92%
<b>18</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>86%</b>
Cooper	25	25	100%
Pettis	56	45	80%
<b>19</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>94%</b>
Cole	97	91	94%
<b>20</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100%</b>
Franklin	101	101	100%
Gasconade	24	24	100%
Osage	5	5	100%
<b>21</b>	<b>903</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>87%</b>
St. Louis Co.	903	783	87%
<b>22</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>81%</b>
St. Louis City	447	363	81%
<b>23</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>678</b>	<b>99%</b>
Jefferson	684	678	99%
<b>24</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>86%</b>
Madison	18	18	100%
St. Francois	101	90	89%
St. Genevieve	22	21	95%
Washington	13	3	23%
<b>25</b>	<b>1,007</b>	<b>922</b>	<b>92%</b>
Maries	29	26	90%
Phelps	455	420	92%
Pulaski	344	303	88%
Texas	179	173	97%
<b>26</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>85%</b>
Camden	80	79	99%
Laclede	173	131	76%
Miller	118	118	100%
Moniteau	21	20	95%
Morgan	79	54	68%

Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>27</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>80%</b>
Bates	78	67	86%
Benton	31	20	65%
Henry	109	82	75%
St. Clair	41	39	95%
<b>28</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>96%</b>
Barton	53	52	98%
Cedar	80	79	99%
Dade	19	18	95%
Vernon	125	117	94%
<b>29</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>97%</b>
Jasper	184	179	97%
<b>30</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>98%</b>
Dallas	50	50	100%
Hickory	25	25	100%
Polk	98	98	100%
Webster	135	130	96%
<b>31</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>100%</b>
Greene	445	445	100%
<b>32</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>93%</b>
Bollinger	31	28	90%
Cape Girardeau	256	255	100%
Perry	77	55	71%
<b>33</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100%</b>
Mississippi	43	43	100%
Scott	69	69	100%
<b>34</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100%</b>
New Madrid	61	61	100%
Pemiscot	83	83	100%
<b>35</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>92%</b>
Dunklin	137	95	69%
Stoddard	399	399	100%
<b>36</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>99%</b>
Butler	193	191	99%
Ripley	35	35	100%
<b>37</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100%</b>
Carter	3	3	100%
Howell	83	83	100%
Oregon	19	19	100%
Shannon	12	12	100%
<b>38</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>60%</b>
Christian	276	166	60%
<b>39</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>96%</b>
Barry	170	161	95%
Lawrence	103	98	95%
Stone	117	114	97%

Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period

Circuit/County	Total Referrals Filed	Standard Met	Percent Standard Met
<b>40</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>98%</b>
McDonald	90	90	100%
Newton	140	135	96%
<b>41</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>95%</b>
Macon	43	42	98%
Shelby	20	18	90%
<b>42</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>97%</b>
Crawford	65	64	98%
Dent	37	36	97%
Iron	30	29	97%
Reynolds	14	12	86%
Wayne	10	10	100%
<b>43</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>98%</b>
Caldwell	27	27	100%
Clinton	25	25	100%
Daviess	12	12	100%
DeKalb	15	13	87%
Livingston	204	201	99%
<b>44</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>71%</b>
Douglas	28	22	79%
Ozark	15	13	87%
Wright	23	12	52%
<b>45</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>84%</b>
Lincoln	174	151	87%
Pike	50	37	74%
<b>46</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>97%</b>
Taney	236	230	97%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>12,295</b>	<b>11,009</b>	<b>90%</b>

Appendix R: 2022 Relative Rate Indices by County - All Offenses

County	Referrals Black	Referrals Hispanic	Referrals Asian	Cases Diverted Black	Cases Diverted Hispanic	Cases Diverted Asian	Secure Detention Black	Secure Detention Hispanic	Secure Detention Asian	Cases Petitioned Black	Cases Petitioned Hispanic	Cases Petitioned Asian
Audrain	2.45											
Boone	6.12		0.27	0.87			2.41			1.51		
Buchanan	3.20	0.49										
Butler	2.95											
Callaway	2.99						2.57			1.62		
Camden	3.11											
Cape Girardeau	8.15											
Cass	4.39									1.46		
Christian	3.30	0.64										
Clay	2.55						3.16					
Cole	8.60			0.70			2.34			2.10		
Cooper	5.70									2.23		
Dunklin	2.75											
Franklin	2.22											
Greene	6.28			0.72						1.86		
Henry	2.88											
Howard	4.11											
Howell	2.92											
Jackson	3.21	0.26		0.76			2.88			1.73		
Jasper	2.29											
Jefferson	2.69											
Johnson	3.99									2.04		
Laclede	2.50											
Lafayette	2.44											
Lewis	2.54											
Lincoln	2.96											
Livingston	2.91											
Macon	4.66											
Marion	1.90									3.00		
Mississippi	1.89						1.95					
Montgomery	2.00											
New Madrid	2.29											
Pemiscot	2.78									2.81		
Pettis	4.94										2.02	
Phelps	2.57											
Pike	3.52											
Platte	3.29	0.23										
Pulaski	1.50	0.43	0.37				3.56					
Randolph	1.68											
Ray	4.06											
St. Charles	5.29	0.48					3.15			2.47		
St. Francois	1.82											
St. Louis County	4.54	0.40	0.11				2.22			1.33		
St. Louis City*	6.05 / -706	0.82 / 6										
Saline	2.65	0.18	2.25							1.80		
Scott	4.37											
Stoddard	2.09											
Taney	2.24	0.44										
Texas	2.63											
Warren	3.00											

\* The statistical parity numbers for the City of St. Louis are included for reference only, since Black youth represent the largest demographic group.

\*\* If the RRI is blank, this means it was not statistically significant.

Key: RRI/ PARITY

Appendix R: 2022 Relative Rate Indices by County - All Offenses

County	Delinquent Findings Black	Delinquent Findings Hispanic	Delinquent Findings Asian	Supervision Black	Supervision Hispanic	Supervision Asian	Secure Confinement Black	Secure Confinement Hispanic	Secure Confinement Asian
Audrain									
Boone									
Buchanan									
Butler									
Callaway									
Camden									
Cape Girardeau									
Cass									
Christian									
Clay									
Cole									
Cooper									
Dunklin									
Franklin									
Greene									
Henry									
Howard									
Howell									
Jackson				0.72					
Jasper									
Jefferson									
Johnson									
Laclede									
Lafayette									
Lewis									
Lincoln									
Livingston									
Macon									
Marion									
Mississippi									
Montgomery									
New Madrid									
Pemiscot									
Pettis									
Phelps									
Pike									
Platte									
Pulaski									
Randolph									
Ray									
St. Charles									
St. Francois									
St. Louis County	0.66			1.80					
St. Louis City*									
Saline									
Scott									
Stoddard									
Taney									
Texas									
Warren									

\* The statistical parity numbers for the City of St. Louis are included for reference only, since Black youth represent the largest demographic group.

\*\* If the RRI is blank, this means it was not statistically significant.

# Missouri's 46 Judicial Circuits and 3 Appellate Districts

